







THE
British Critic,
QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

No. IV.—OCT. 1827.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

ADVOWSON FOR SALE, SOMERSETSHIRE.

A RECTORY *under value*, with a prospect of Early Possession, and, in every respect, most desirable.

Also A VALUABLE ESTATE, in the same Parish with the RECTORY.

Apply, post-paid, to A. B. Post Office, Taunton.

DEBRETT'S PEERAGE.—A SUPPLEMENT to this Work, completing it to the present Period, is just Published, price 1s. It contains all the NEW CREATIONS in 1826 and 1827, with the Arms; the SUPPLEMENT published in August, 1826, being incorporated.

Printed for Rivingtons; Egerton; Cuthell; Clarkes; Longman and Co.; Cadell; Richardson; Booth; Booker; Baldwin & Co.; Bagster; Hatchards; Hamilton & Co.; Harding; Parbury and Co.; Martin; Lloyds; and Saunders & Hodgson.

July, 1827. *.* The Peerage may be had, complete, price 1*l.* 4*s.* in boards.

Early in October will be published, in Five large Volumes Octavo, the Second Part (containing the Acts and Epistles) of

RECENSIO SYNOPTICA ANNOTATIONIS SACRÆ, being a Critical Digest and Synoptical Arrangement of the most important Annotations on the New Testament, Exegetical, Philological, and Doctrinal; carefully collected and condensed, from the best Commentators, both Ancient and Modern, and so digested as to form one consistent body of Annotation, in which each Portion is systematically attributed to its respective Author, and the Foreign Matter translated into English; the whole accompanied with a copious Body of original Annotations.

By the Rev. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, M.A.

Of Sidney College, Cambridge, Vicar of Bisbrooke in Rutland, and Curate of Tilton and Tugby in Leicestershire.

. The FIRST PART contains the GOSPELS, in Three large Volumes Octavo, price 2*l.* 2*s.* in boards.

“It would be impossible to convey to our readers an adequate idea of the mass of information which the learned author has brought to bear upon the numerous passages which he has undertaken to illustrate; and we can safely say, that in the portion of the New Testament which this part of the Work embraces—the Four Gospels—the enquirer will find very few, of which Mr. Bloomfield has not given a complete and satisfactory exposition.”—Quarterly Theological Review, Sept. 1826.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

This Day is published, in Quarto, price 5s. boards,

A GENERAL INDEX to the FOURTH EDITION of CALMET'S DICTIONARY of the BIBLE, and the FRAGMENTS: comprising an Alphabetical List of Subjects, and a Methodical Arrangement of Texts, illustrated or explained. To which is prefixed, a SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS, or General Outline of the Work.

London: Published by B. J. Holdsworth, 18, St. Paul's Church Yard.

Of whom, Prospectuses of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible and Fragments, together with the Scientific Analysis, may be had, *gratis*.

This Day is published, in Octavo, price 9s. 6d.

THE NULLITY of the ROMAN FAITH, being a Practical Refutation of the Doctrine of Infallibility, in a View of the History and Evidence of the leading Tenets of the Church of Rome.

By JOHN GARBETT, M. A.

Printed for John Murray, Albemarle Street.

This Day is published, in Octavo, price 30s. with Twelve Illustrations beautifully engraved by Finden.

HISTORY of the GLORIOUS RETURN of the VAUDOIS, to their VALLEY, in 1689. By HENRI ARNAUD, their Pastor and Colonel. From the Original of H. ARNAUD. With a Compendium of the History of that People, previous and subsequently to that Event.

By HUGH DYKE ACLAND, Esq.

Printed for John Murray, Albemarle Street.

Just Published, in Octavo, price 21s.

A SERIES of Plain and Familiar DISCOURSES on the APOSTLES' CREED, delivered in the New Church of St. Luke, Chelsea.

By the Rev. JAMES HUTCHINS, A.M.

Curate of the United Parishes of St. Ann and Agnes, and St. John Zachary, Aldersgate; and Lecturer of St. Luke, Chelsea.

Printed for William Watson, St. Ann's Lane, Aldersgate.

This Day is published, in two large Volumes, 8vo. price 1l. 8s. in boards,

A CONNECTION of SACRED and PROFANE HISTORY, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, (intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.)

By the Rev. MICHAEL RUSSELL, LL.D.

Episcopal Minister at Leith.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; and sold by Bell and Bradfute, and Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.

HALL'S NEW GENERAL ATLAS.

On the FIRST of NOVEMBER, 1827, will be Published,

By LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, and GREEN, London,

AND TO BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS AND DEALERS IN MAPS,

THE FIRST PART,

(PRICE TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE,)

OF

A NEW GENERAL ATLAS of FIFTY-ONE MAPS, with the Divisions and Boundaries carefully coloured: constructed entirely from New Drawings, and engraved by SIDNEY HALL. To be completed in Seventeen Monthly Parts.

With every disposition to acknowledge the respective merits of the various geographical compilations that have appeared of late years, the Proprietors of the present work do not hesitate to declare, that they have undertaken it from a full conviction of its necessity. The discoveries of recent voyagers and travellers in every known region of the globe, the nautical surveys and exploratory enterprises instituted by various governments and states, and the important changes made in the demarcation of boundaries between contiguous territories belonging to different Powers, continue to supply a multitude of data for increasing our knowledge of the earth and its divisions, natural and political—and are daily furnishing additions and amendments for the published records of that knowledge. With these materials the Geographer is enabled to supply the deficiencies and correct the errors of his predecessors; and thus a new Atlas, like a new Cyclopædia, may by due care and diligence, be made to possess all the advantages of its prototypes without their faults, and must for a time claim precedence as the latest compendium of a science which like all others is incessantly progressive.

From these considerations, and from the very natural desire of applying to a useful purpose materials which had been long accumulating, the present undertaking originated. In preparing the drawings the best and most recent authorities have been consulted; reference has been had to archives and to private collections not generally accessible, and the emendatory suggestions of experienced travellers, both native and foreign, have been requested and obtained. The greater number of the maps are in a very advanced state, and are engraved on such a plan as to admit of all the alterations that fresh discoveries may render necessary at any time previous to publication.

The work will be completed in Seventeen Parts, each containing Three Maps. A part will be published every month, price half a guinea. The size of each map has been fixed at twenty inches by sixteen, those dimensions being found most convenient for preservation and reference, and in the chorographical delineations, as well as in the *orthography* of the names inserted, the strictest attention to accuracy has been and will be unremittingly bestowed.

* * * A few India Proof Impressions will be taken off and carefully coloured, price 15s. per Number, and as no more will be printed than are previously subscribed for, early orders are solicited.

A NEW HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

On the 1st of October will be published, No. I. price 6*d.* to be continued Monthly, of

A HISTORY of ENGLAND, from the Earliest Periods to the Present Time; in which it is intended to consider Men and Events on Christian Principles.

By a CLERGYMAN of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

This work has been undertaken from the wish that our National History might be taught without connecting with it a constant call to worldly-mindedness.

The Author does not propose to write for the professed Political Scholar; but offers the result of his studies for the benefit of those who are contented to aim at less ambitious attainments.

He will, therefore, endeavour to make whatever he has occasion to speak of intelligible to persons of limited information; and to keep down the size of his work to about Goldsmith's History. At the same time, as the sanguinary details of war are, in his view, the least important of the subjects on which he has to treat, the brevity of his notices of them will leave a larger space for recording and examining the progress and decline of Religion, the formation of our excellent Constitution, and the state of Public Morals and Literature, and the advance and diffusion of the Useful Arts.

The work will be printed in Duodecimo, on a good Paper, each Number will contain Forty-eight Pages of Letter-press, and it is presumed that it will be comprised in about Forty-eight Numbers.

It will be published by C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall, and will be sold by all other Booksellers.

*. * The Preface, explaining the Plan of the Work and the motives which induced the undertaking, may be had *gratis*.

This Day is published, in Two Large Volumes 8vo. Price 1*l.* 12*s.* in boards.

HUG'S INTRODUCTION to the WRITINGS of the NEW TESTAMENT. Translated from the German, with Notes.

By the REV. DR. WAIT,
Of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

This Day is published, No. I. price 7*s.* 6*d.* of the

FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.—Contents: I. Condé's History of the Dominion of the Arabs in Spain.—II. On the Supernatural in Fictitious Composition.—Works of Hoffmann.—III. Dumas's History of the Campaigns from 1799 to 1814.—IV. Deville's Letters on Bengal.—V. Manzoni's Italian Tragedies.—VI. French Books on Gastronomy.—VII. Berard on the Influence of Civilization on Public Health.—VIII. Schubert's Travels in Sweden.—IX. Dutrochet on Vital Motion in Animals and Vegetables.—X. Rizo on Modern Greek Literature.—XI. Botta's History of Italy.—Miscellaneous Literary Notices, No. I.—List of the principal Works published on the Continent from January to June, 1827.

Published by Treuttel and Würtz, Treuttel, Jun. and Richter, Foreign Booksellers to the King, No. 30, Soho Square, to whom all Communications for the Editor should be addressed; sold also by Cadell and Co. Edinburgh, and J. Cumming, Dublin.

STANDARD WORKS IN DIVINITY,

PUBLISHED BY

C. and J. RIVINGTON, *St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.*

I.

THE OLD TESTAMENT, arranged on the Basis of Lightfoot's Chronicle, in Historical and Chronological Order, in such manner, that the Books, Chapters, Psalms, Prophecies, &c. may be read as one connected History, in the very Words of the Authorized Translation. To the above are added Six Indexes. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton. The Second Edition, with the addition of Marginal References, in Two large Volumes 8vo. Price £2. in boards.

II.

The **NEW TESTAMENT**, arranged in Chronological and Historical Order, (in such manner that the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Acts, may be read as one connected History.) The Gospels on the Basis of the Harmonies of Lightfoot, Doddridge, Pilkington, Newcome, and Michaelis—the Account of the Resurrection, on the Authorities of West, Townson, and Cranfield. The Epistles are inserted in their Places, and divided according to the Apostles' Arguments. With copious Notes on many of the principal Subjects in Theology. By the same Author. Second Edition, with Marginal References. In Two large Volumes, 8vo. Price £2 in boards.

III.

ANNOTATIONS on the **FOUR GOSPELS** and the **ACTS** of the **APOSTLES**. Compiled and abridged for the Use of Students. Sixth Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. Price 1*l.* 4*s.*

IV.

ANNOTATIONS on the **EPISTLES**; being a Continuation of the Above, and principally designed for the Use of Candidates for Holy Orders. By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Emanuel College, Cambridge, and Vicar of Bolton-le-Moors. Second Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. Price 18*s.*

V.

INTRODUCTION to the **NEW TESTAMENT**, by SIR JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS, late Professor of the University of Gottingen, &c. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German, and considerably augmented with Notes. By the Rt. Rev. HERBERT MARSH, D.D. Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Fourth Edition. 6 vols. 8vo. Price 3*l.* 3*s.*

VI.

A KEY to the **OLD TESTAMENT** and **APOCRYPHA**; or an Account of their several Books, of the Contents and Authors, and of the Times in which they were respectively written. By the Right Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D. Lord Bishop of Bristol. Eighth Edition. Price 13*s.*

VII.

A KEY to the **NEW TESTAMENT**, giving an Account of their several Books, their Contents, their Authors, and of the Times, Places and Occasions on which they were respectively written. By the Right Rev. THOMAS PERCY, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Dromore. Eighth Edition. 8vo. price 3*s.* 6*d.* An Edition in 12mo. price 3*s.*

The two last-mentioned Works may be had together in One Volume 8vo. Price 16*s.*

VIII.

The **WORKS** of **ARCHBISHOP SECKER** complete; with his Life by Bishop PORTEUS. 6 vols. 8vo. With a Portrait, Price 2*l.* 14*s.*

The Lectures on the Catechism may be had separately. 8vo. 9*s.* boards; 12mo. 4*s.* bound.

(RIVINGTONS' Books continued.)

IX.

The THEOLOGICAL and MISCELLANEOUS WORKS of the late Rev. WILLIAM JONES, M.A. Minister of Nayland, Suffolk. To which is prefixed, a Short Account of his Life and Writings, by WILLIAM STEVENS, Esq.

A New Edition, in 6 vols. 8vo. with a New Portrait, by Dean. Price 3*l.* 3*s.*

X.

The HOLY BIBLE, according to the authorized Version; with NOTES, Explanatory and Practical; taken principally from the most eminent Writers of the Church of England: with appropriate Introduction, Tables, Index, Maps and Plans. Prepared and arranged by the Rev. GEORGE D'OYLY, D.D. and the Rt. Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. In 17 Parts, price 3*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.*; or on Royal paper, in 3 vols. boards, 7*l.*

XI.

A CONCORDANCE to the HOLY BIBLE; to which is added a GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX, with the Calendar and Tables of Lessons; designed to accompany any Quarto Edition of the Bible, and adapted to the Maps and Notes of "The Family Bible," published under the Direction of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 5*s.* on Medium, and 7*s.* on royal paper. Edited by JAMES W. BELLAMY, M.A. Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, and Prebendary of St. Paul's.

Another Edition. Royal 8vo. 8*s.*

XII.

The BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, with NOTES, Explanatory, Practical and Historical, from approved Writers of the Church of England. By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. In 4to. 1*l.* 16*s.* Royal paper, 3*l.* 12*s.*

XIII.

The BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, with NOTES, selected from the Above. By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. In 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 4*s.* Royal paper, 1*l.* 16*s.*

XIV.

A SUMMARY of CHRISTIAN FAITH and PRACTICE, Confirmed by References to the Text of Holy Scripture; compared with the Liturgy, Articles and Homilies of the Church of England; and illustrated by Extracts from the chief of those Works which received the Sanction of Public Authority, from the Time of the Reformation to the final Revision of the established Formularies. By the Rev. E. J. BURROW, D.D. F.R. and L.S. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

XV.

The CHURCHMAN ARMED against the ERRORS of the TIME; containing Extracts from various Authors, arranged under Five Heads:—Part 1. On the Constitution of the Church of Christ, or the Ministerial Commission, and on the Unity to be preserved in the Church. Part 2. Ecclesiastical Establishments and Tests. Part 3. Church of England. Part 4. Popery. Part 5. Toleration. By "The Society for the Distribution of Tracts in Defence of the United Church of England and Ireland as by Law established." 3 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.*

XVI.

The SCHOLAR ARMED against the ERRORS of the TIME; or, a Collection of Tracts on the Principles and Evidences of Christianity, the Constitution of the Church, and the Authority of Civil Government. The whole intended for the Information and Assistance of Young Students. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 4*s.*

On the 1st of November will be published, price 12s. bound in Silk, and in a Case,
A NEW ANNUAL, entitled,

THE WINTER'S WREATH; or, a Collection of ORIGINAL
PIECES in Prose and Verse, by some of the most popular Authors of the present
Day, amongst whom are WORDSWORTH, GIBBORNE, ROSCOE, Mrs. HANNAH MORE,
Mrs. HEMANS, BOWRING, &c. &c.

* * The object of the publication is to blend instruction with amusement,—taste
with utility. The profits arising from its sale will be appropriated to charitable
purposes.

The Work will be printed in the best manner, on superfine Paper, and embellished
with several beautiful Engravings from Designs of Westall, Corbould, Cooper, by
Heath, Finden, and other eminent Engravers.

Printed for Geo. B. Whittaker, London; and George Smith, Liverpool.

This Day is published in 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

A SERMON preached at St. Mary's, on Thursday, July 26, 1827,
before the Hon. Sir JOSEPH LITLEDALE, one of the Justices of the Court of
King's Bench, and the Hon. JOHN VAUGHAN, one of the Barons of the Court of
Exchequer, at the Summer Assizes for the County of Oxford.

By DANIEL WILSON, A.M.
Vicar of Islington.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall
Mall; and G. Wilson, Essex Street, London; and J. Parker, Oxford.

Books Printed for JOHN COCHRAN, No. 108, in the Strand.

LAW'S SERMONS, 8vo., Price 10s. 6d. boards.

SERMONS preached in the BRITISH CHAPEL at ST. PETERSBURG,
by the Rev. EDWARD LAW, A.M. late Student of Christ Church, Oxford;
Chaplain to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; to the Russia
Company, and to the British Factory at St. Petersburg.

DR. COTTON'S MEMOIR, 8vo., 3s. 6d. sewed.

MEMOIR of a French Translation of the New Testament, in which
the Mass and Purgatory are found in the Sacred Text; together with Bishop Kidder's
Reflections on the same. Accompanied by Notes. By HENRY COTTON, LL.D.
Archdeacon of Cashel.

DR. BARRETT'S PSALMS, 2s. 6d. bound.

A COURSE of PSALMS, adapted to the Services of the United
Churches of England and Ireland; with Psalms for Particular Occasions; and Hymns
for Christmas and Easter Day. Selected from the New Version. By the Rev. J. T.
BARRETT, D.D. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. Fifth Edition. Dedicated
(by permission) to the Lord Bishop of London.

The Selection from the New Version affords a complete Manual for parochial Psalmody, in strict
conformity to Public Authority; it is used in many Churches of the Metropolis, and is now re-
commended to the attention of the Parochial Clergy throughout England and Ireland.

N.B. A cheap Edition may be had for the use of Parochial, Sunday, and National Schools.
Price 1s. 6d. bound in cloth, or 6l. per hundred.

JACOB'S PSALM TUNES, Price 3s. sewed.

A SET of PLAIN PSALM TUNES, for DR. BARRETT'S Course
of Psalms, selected from the New Version; adapted and arranged by B. JACOB, with
Chants for the Gloria Patri.

HOMERI ILIAS, CUM NOTIS ANGLICIS.

This Day is published, in Two Volumes 8vo., price 1*l.* 4*s.* in boards.

THE ILIAD of HOMER, chiefly from the Text of Heyne, with Copious English Notes illustrating the Grammatical Construction; the Manners and Customs, the Mythology and Antiquities of the Heroic Ages: and Preliminary Observations on Points of Classical Interest and Importance connected with Homer and his Writings.

By the Rev. WILLIAM TROLLOPE, M.A.

Late of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and One of the Masters of Christ's Hospital.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

OF WHOM MAY BE HAD, LATELY PUBLISHED,

PENTALOGIA GRÆCA. Sophoclis *Œdipus Tyrannus*; *Œdipus Coloneus*, et *Antigone*; Euripidis *Phœnissæ*; et *Æschyli Septem contra Thebas*. *Quinque scilicet Dramata de celeberrima Thebaide Scripta.* Notis Anglice Scriptis illustravit, et *Lexicon vocum difficiliorum* adjecit, GULIELMUS TROLLOPE, M.A. In 8vo. price 14*s.* boards.

Just published, in Octavo, price 1*s.* 6*d.*

A SERMON, preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, July 15th, 1827, at the Consecration of the Hon. and Right Rev. HUGH PERCY, D.D. Lord Bishop of Rochester.

By JOHN LONSDALE, B.D.

Fellow of Eton College, and Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

THE CHRISTIAN'S REST.

This Day is published, in Octavo, price 1*s.*

A SERMON, preached in the Parish Church of Hackney, on Sunday, June 24th, 1827, on occasion of the Death of the Rev. GEO. PAROISSIEN, M.A. Rector of West Hackney, and for thirty-six years Curate of Hackney.

By the Rev. EDWARD IRISH, LL.B.

Of Magdalene College, Cambridge; Curate and Afternoon Lecturer of Hackney.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; and W. Jackson, Hackney.

DR. CLARKE'S COMMENTARY ON THE SCRIPTURES,

In 8 Volumes, Quarto, price 14*l.* boards.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; containing the Old and New Testaments: the Text taken from the most correct Copies of present authorized Version; with the Marginal Readings, a Collection of Parallel Texts, and copious Summaries to each Chapter, with a Commentary and Critical Notes; designed as a help to a better understanding of the Sacred Writings.

By ADAM CLARKE, LL.D. F.A.S. M.R.I.A.

Printed for Joseph Butterworth and Son, No. 43, Fleet Street.

The Publishers recommend those Subscribers to the Work, who have not hitherto completed their Sets, to do so without delay, as they will not hold themselves answerable to sell the Parts separately after the present year.

C O N T E N T S

OF

N^o. IV.



	PAGE
ART. I. Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ. By the Rev. Edward Burton, M.A. late Student of Christ-Church.	265
II. Directions for the Study of Theology, in a Series of Letters from a Bishop to his Son, on his admission into Holy Orders. By the Right Reverend George Gleig, LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.S.A., and Honorary Associate of the Royal Society of Literature.	303
III. History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy in the Sixteenth Century, including a Sketch of the History of the Reformation in the Grisons. By Thomas M'Crie, D.D.	321
IV. A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke. By Frederick Schleiermacher, with an Introduction by the Translator, containing an Account of the Controversy respecting the Origin of the Three First Gospels since Bishop Marsh's Dissertation.	342

ART.	PAGE
V. The Life, Diary, and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale, Knight, sometime Garter Principal King of Arms; with an Appendix, containing an Account of his published Works, an Index to his manuscript Collections, Copies of Monumental Inscriptions to the Memory of the Dugdale Family, and Heraldic Grants and Pedigrees. Edited by William Hamper, Esq. F.S.A. . . .	399
VI. Sermons, Chiefly Practical, Preached in the Parish Church of Clapham, Surrey. By William Dealtry, B.D. F.R.S. Rector of Clapham, and of Watton, Herts; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. . . .	417
VII. On the Historical Types contained in the Old Testament. Twenty Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge in the Year 1826, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Hulse. By the Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Catherine Hall. . . .	433
VIII. 1. Hymns written and adapted to the Weekly Church Service of the Year. By the Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta.	
2. The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year. . . .	443
IX. 1. Human Sacrifices in India. Substance of the Speech of John Poynder, Esq. at the Courts of Proprietors of East India Stock, held on the 21st and 28th days of March, 1827.	
2. Substance of the Speech of Randle Jackson, Esq. on the same subject. . . .	453
X. A Vindication of the Sentiments contained in a "Letter to a Clergyman on the Peculiar Tenets of the Present Day," in Answer to the Letters of the Rev. Mr. Whish, which were intended as a Reply to that Publication; comprising a more Ample Discussion of Various Im-	

ART.	PAGE
portant Subjects which have given rise to Controversy in the Church. To which is added an Appendix, containing a few Remarks addressed to another Antagonist. By R. Bransby Cooper, Esq. M.P.	479
XI. A Sermon, preached at the Ordination of His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York, held at Bishopsthorpe, July 2, 1826. By the Rev. William Hett, M.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge.	481
XII. Joseph separated from his Kindred, and from his native Land, to be a Ruler in a foreign Nation: a Sermon, preached in the Chapel of the Hon. the East India Company's College, Haileybury, at the Close of Term. By the Rev. Professor Walter, B.D. & F.R.S., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; and Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Northumberland.	484
XIII. 1. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, March 25th, 1827, at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Robert, Lord Bishop of Bristol. By Joseph Holden Pott, M.A. Archdeacon of London, and Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter.	
2. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, July 15th, 1827, at the Consecration of the Honourable and Right Reverend Hugh Percy, D.D. Lord Bishop of Rochester. By John Lonsdale, B.D. Fellow of Eton College, and Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.	487
XIV. On the Importance of giving Religious Instruction to the Slave Population in the West Indies: a Sermon, preached at the Cathedral and Parish Church of St. Michael, Barbados, on Sunday, the 11th of February, 1827. By Edward Eliot, B.D. Archdeacon of Barbados.	493

ART.	PAGE
XV. A Visitation Sermon, preached at Northampton, on Monday, July 16, 1827, before the Right Rev. Herbert Marsh, D.D. Lord Bishop of Peterborough. By the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, M.A. Rector of Brington, Northamptonshire, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Chester.	495
XVI. An Inquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years. By S. R. Maitland, Perpetual Curate of Christ-Church, Gloucester.	497



Parliamentary Proceedings respecting the Church.	
Unitarian Marriage Bill.	501
Case of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.	506
State of the Dioceses in England and Wales.	509
Proceedings of the Universities.	514

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,

AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

XXXX
C. 3
OCTOBER, 1827.

ART. I.—*Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ.* By the Rev. Edward Burton, M. A. late Student of Christ-Church. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1826. 8vo. pp. 478. 10s. 6d.

THOSE who are fully acquainted with the present state of the Unitarian controversy in this country may, not improbably, suppose that any new attempt to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ from the testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, can be little better than a needless repetition of the arguments of Bull and Horsley; or, at the best, a barren waste of theological learning, and an inglorious triumph over a prostrate foe. It is true, indeed, that they who already know how completely every position which the Racovian polemics, or their followers in modern times, have attempted to occupy, has been demolished by these champions of the Church; they who are familiar with their irrefragable writings, or with the no less powerful works of Pearson, Leslie, and Waterland; they who are aware by what violent perversions and forced interpretations of the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists; by what a perilous denial of their inspiration and authority; by what gross and palpable mis-statements of the opinions of the primitive Church; and by what contemptible sophistries and subterfuges the great hyperaspists of modern Unitarianism, Lindsey, Priestley, and Belsham, have endeavoured to maintain their own cause, and to escape from the resistless attack of their opponents, will not require any new arguments to convince them, that the primitive and apostolic Church universally asserted the true and proper Divinity of Jesus Christ, and anathematized the heretical impugners of this Catholic doctrine: and to them, of course, the present publication will add but

little to enlarge their knowledge, or confirm their faith. Yet, paradoxical as it may seem, these are the very persons who will peruse it, we imagine, with the greatest pleasure; because they alone will be able justly to appreciate the patient original research, the sound judgment, the extensive erudition, the luminous illustrations of Scripture, and the frequent felicitous exposures of the hopeless ignorance, and astonishing temerity in assertion, of the Unitarian commentators, which are displayed in almost every page of Mr. Burton's volume. We have perused the work with unmixed satisfaction. It is the production of a sound and judicious theologian, whose mind has been exercised and improved by long familiarity and daily intercourse with the writings of the Christian Fathers; and will tend, we are persuaded, more than any other publication of modern times, to revive amongst our candidates in divinity the too-long neglected study of those invaluable relics.

On this point we feel no common solicitude; and would earnestly recal to the recollection of those whom it chiefly concerns, the seventh of the well-timed rules, which King James I. addressed, two centuries ago, to the heads of the University of Oxford. "*Ut Theologiæ tyronibus in manus traderentur auctores cum ecclesiâ Anglicanâ quoad disciplinam et doctrinam potissimum sentientes; utque ad operam iisdem, necnon sanctis patribus, conciliis, scriptoribusque scholasticis, historicis, polemiciis, impendendam excitarentur; ne scilicet in abbreviatoribus, scriptisque compendiaris diutius hærentes, lubrica ponerent studiorum theologicorum fundamenta.*"* What good effects this course of study could produce had sufficiently been proved at the eventful era of the Reformation. The great authors of that memorable work, Ridley and Cranmer, were skilled, beyond their contemporaries, in the writings of the Christian Fathers; and, by their light, were enabled to detect a world of errors, which, in the lapse of time, had crept into the faith and practice of the western Church; to expose the novelty of many pretended claims to divine and apostolical tradition; successfully to resist the long encroachments of papal supremacy; and to restore our national Church to the primitive purity of faith, and, as near as the change of times would permit, to the primitive form of discipline. But a number of our divines who, under the Marian persecution, had taken shelter among the Protestant churches of the Continent, became so passionately attached to the Presbyterian mode of church-government, which was first established by Calvin, that, on their return to this country, they were

* *Hist. et Antiqq. Universitatis Oxon. in ann. 1616. Lib. i. p. 322.*

unwearied in their endeavours to subvert the episcopal rule, and to mould the Church of England after the pattern of Geneva, both as to its rule of faith, and form of polity. This faction was beginning to spread itself throughout our universities, and to occupy the professorial chairs, when King James addressed his admonitions to the university of Oxford. They were promptly carried into effect; and from that moment the principles of Calvinism may date their decline in England. But this, though great, was not the only benefit that ensued. Under the judicious system then established, there was trained up a race of divines who proved themselves the invincible champions of our national Church against the hordes of Presbyterians and Roman Catholics by whom it was assailed on opposite sides, and were also the noblest defenders of the Catholic faith against its Arian and Socinian opponents. So complete, indeed, was their success, that all their adversaries were fairly driven out of the field; and the only enemies left for the next generation of polemics to encounter, were less the assailants of the doctrines or discipline of our Established Church, than the oppugners of the Christian religion: we speak of the Deists, Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, and Collins, with the inferior rabble of free-thinkers who followed in their rear, Chubb, Toland, Tindal, and Morgan. To crush these reptiles, it was not necessary for their antagonists to employ the massive weapons which Jeremy Taylor and Bull had drawn forth from the armoury of the ancient Fathers. A different mode of warfare was to be adopted; and it was conducted with such skill and vigour, by Leslie, Leland, Warburton, and Bentley, that Infidelity, which, at first, could number the better vulgar in her train, has long been fain to hide her head; and though she sometimes ventures to peep out of her hole, and to show her face in the senate, she meets in general with such a cold reception there, that she is glad to look for encouragement in the worshipful society that frequents the spouting-clubs of our populous cities.

These causes may, in some degree, account for the comparative neglect into which the writings of the Fathers have, unhappily, fallen: but it is impossible to justify the want, so long felt by the candidates for ordination in both our universities, of any thing that deserves the name of a theological education. The Philistines are upon us. Our old opponents, the Roman Catholic and Socinian, forgetful of their former discomfitures, are again appearing in the field, and dare us to the battle; and these are enemies who cannot be encountered with success, or even with safety, except by those who fight under the banners of the primitive Fathers, and are accustomed to wield their arms. If, therefore, we were insensible to the dishonour of degenerating from the

bright examples of our ancestors, mere prudence would urge us to re-establish in our universities the strict habits of theological discipline. Let this be done, and, to whatever stratagems our adversaries may resort, we shall have no fears for the issue. It has hitherto fared with the Church of England, in every conflict with the opponents of her law and her faith, as it fared with *Sir Guyon*, when *Sans-loy* and *Sans-foy* at once assailed him; she has not only escaped unharmed, but has acquired additional vigour from their fierce assaults, and has stedfastly maintained her course with increasing confidence.

“ As a tall ship tossed in troublous seas,
Whom raging winds, threatening to make the prey
Of the rough rocks, do diversly disease,
Meets two contrary billowes by the way,
That her on either side do sore assay,
And boast to swallow her in greedy grave;
She, scorning both their spights, does make wide way,
And with her breast breaking the fomy wave,
Does ride on both their backs, and fair herself doth save.”

Faery Queene, b. ii. canto 2. st. 24.

In every dispute concerning the apostolicity of any point of Christian discipline or doctrine, it is obviously of the highest importance to ascertain what was the belief, or practice, of those Christians who lived in the first ages of the Church. They who, like *Hermas*, *Clement*, and *Ignatius*, were contemporaries of the Apostles, and fellow labourers with them, could not possibly be ignorant of the doctrines which they taught, or of the discipline which they established in their respective churches; and we may be sure they would religiously hand down to their successors that doctrine, and that form of government, which they themselves had received from the Apostles. This train of reasoning may securely be carried on through the second and third centuries. Some erroneous opinions began, indeed, to show themselves, and some innovations were gradually made in the rites and ceremonies of the Church; but none of these affected the fundamentals of religion; and it is unquestionable, that the highest certainty at which we can now arrive, respecting the truth of any doctrine or the true interpretation of inspired Scripture respecting any fundamental article of the Christian faith, must be acquired by showing that it was invariably maintained in every age of the Church, and tracing it upwards to the Apostles' days, through an unbroken chain of ecclesiastical writers. This is what the Roman-Catholics pretend to do, but have never been able to accomplish; for the first links of the chain wholly fail them. The mere silence of the Fathers of the three first centuries, concerning those doc-

trinal points which are held by the Church of Rome and rejected by the Church of England, affords a strong presumption against them; and, in some instances, this silence is almost equivalent to an express assertion, that the doctrine in question was then unheard-of. Thus, for example, the non-mention by Hermas of the doctrines of purgatory, of plenary sacerdotal absolution and auricular confession, is about as decisive against the Church of Rome on those points, as if that Father had explicitly condemned some heretics of his day for maintaining them; for since it is one great object of the "Shepherd" to show the necessity and efficacy of penance, and the future consequences of unrepented sin, it is utterly incompatible with the assumed apostolicity of these doctrines, that he should not once have mentioned, or even alluded to, them. In the question, however, with the Presbyterian, respecting the primitive form of ecclesiastical government, and in the controversy with the Arian or Socinian, concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ, we are not left to probable inferences; the direct testimony of the Fathers is absolutely conclusive against them all. Socinus himself, therefore, would gladly have rejected their evidence altogether, well knowing on which side it preponderated. But, since both parties appeal to Scripture, the point to be established is chiefly this—Whether the Unitarian or the Trinitarian interpretation of the Scriptures is the true one? and, in this case, to reject the evidence of the Fathers would be just as absurd, as to reject the opinions of all contemporary lawyers, and the uniform decisions of the judges, if the true meaning of some ancient statute were in dispute. It would amount, in fact, to an abandonment of the question. Accordingly, the modern Unitarians have laboured hard to bring over the primitive Fathers to their side; and have maintained, with a surprising confidence, that those who lived next to the Apostles, and must be acknowledged to have been best acquainted with their doctrines, understood the Scripture in the same sense in which it has been interpreted by the later followers of Socinus, and were assertors, like them, of the simple humanity of Christ. It is very forcibly argued by Dr. Priestley, and in this instance, at least, it would not be easy to dissent from his opinion, that "it will be an unanswerable argument, *à priori*, against any particular doctrine being contained in the Scriptures, that it was never understood to be so by those persons for whose immediate use the Scriptures were written, and who must have been much better qualified to understand them, in that respect at least, than we can pretend to be at this day."*

* History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ, p. 15.

Now there is a multitude of passages in the New Testament in which, if they are interpreted literally, and according to the obvious meaning of the words, the proper Godhead of Jesus Christ is plainly and unequivocally asserted; and there is a much greater number in which it is necessarily implied in the divine attributes which are ascribed to him, and in the worship which is paid or directed to be paid him. Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his "*Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*," has brought forward thirteen texts of Scripture, in which he is expressly called GOD; and this number may be very considerably increased. We will adduce only five of those texts omitted by Dr. Clarke, in which this title is given him; and because the sense of these passages is somewhat obscured in our authorized version, we will give them in the original Greek, annexing to each as literal a translation as our language will permit.

2 Thess. i. 12. Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"According to the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ."

Tit. ii. 13. Προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα, καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"Looking for the blessed hope and manifestation of the glory of the great God and Saviour of us, Jesus Christ."

2 Pet. i. 1. ἐν ἐκαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Jude 4. τὸν μόνον ἑσπότην, Θεὸν, καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι—"Denying the only Master, God, and Lord of us, Jesus Christ."

Beside these, Dr. Clarke produces eight texts in which it is declared that "the world was made by him;" thirty-three in which the highest titles, powers and perfections of the Godhead are ascribed to him; and seventy in which he is represented as the proper object of invocation and worship. We allege the authority of Dr. S. Clarke in preference to any other, both because there are few divines who can be compared to him as a textuary, and because, his prejudices being notoriously unfavourable to the Catholic doctrine, his testimony on this point is beyond suspicion. There is one very important circumstance always to be borne in mind in considering these passages of Scripture, in which the divinity of Jesus Christ is, past all controversy, *literally* asserted. The circumstance to which we allude is this, that the authors of these passages were all Jews; the strictest maintainers of the Divine Unity; men who would have trembled at the blasphemy of ascribing to any creature, however exalted, any of the peculiar attributes or titles of the Godhead, and at the impiety of rendering him any portion of that worship which is due to God alone. Bearing this in mind, we shall find it very difficult to persuade our-

selves that the apostles would have spoken of Christ as they unquestionably have spoken of him, if they had not believed, or rather known, that he was truly God; unless it can be shown, by clear and frequent examples, that it was customary for the Jewish writers to speak of their prophets in this most hyperbolic language, and to apply to them, without reserve, the incommunicable titles and attributes of the Supreme Creator.

But there are other passages in which the proper humanity of Jesus Christ is asserted in the plainest terms. It is acknowledged by all Christians. And it must also be acknowledged, that to reconcile these apparently opposite propositions, that Christ is "perfect God and perfect man," both of which the universal Christian Church, on the authority of Scripture, receives as true, presents a difficulty which, on mere philosophical principles, is absolutely insuperable; for, independent of a direct revelation on the subject, human reason could never conceive it possible that the divine and human natures should be united in the same person; nor, admitting the doctrine to be ever so distinctly revealed, can it comprehend the *mode* of this mysterious union. Yet, though we know nothing of the essences and first principles of things, and our own nature, i. e. the union of our souls and bodies, is a perfect mystery to us, so intolerable is it to our self-sufficiency to admit the truth of any proposition which we cannot fully comprehend, that whilst there have not been wanting persons who, to get rid of the difficulty which the contemplations of our own compounded nature presents, have either denied that there is any such thing as spiritual substance, or disputed the existence of matter; others, from the very first promulgation of Christianity, have attempted to explain away the mysterious doctrine of the *theanthropy** of Jesus Christ, either by dividing his person, or denying his proper Godhead, or his proper manhood. All these heretics were obliged of necessity, either partially or totally, to reject the Holy Scriptures, the plain language of which could by no sophistry be reconciled to their impious and fantastic theories. It is remarkable, however, that the earliest heretics of whom we have any distinct account, swerved from the truth by rejecting, not the divinity, but the humanity of Jesus Christ; and whilst they elevated his Godhead above that of the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the Creator of the universe, they denied the reality of his human nature, and affirmed that he was man in appearance only. The epistles of the apostolical Ignatius abound in passages in which the errors of these Docetæ are severely condemned. In the

* We take the liberty of using this word notwithstanding the anathema of Quintian *Εἰ τις θεανθρωπίαν λέγει, καὶ οὐχὶ Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον μᾶλλον λέγει, ἀναθεματίζισθω.*—*Apud Zonar. in Can. Concil. p. 556. Vide Suicer. in voc.*

epistle to the Smyrneans, which is directed chiefly to the confutation of their pernicious heresy, after enumerating the principal articles of the Christian faith respecting the incarnate Son of God, he proceeds thus: Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι' ἡμᾶς ἵνα σωθῶμεν· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν· οὐχ' ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν, τὸ δόκειν αὐτὸν πεποθέναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δόκειν ὄντες· καὶ καθὼς φρονοῦσιν συμδύσεται αὐτοῖς, οὔσιν ἀσωμάτοις καὶ δαιμονικοῖς*—a passage which is farther remarkable for the assertion implied in it, that, in the future life, the bodies of the wicked shall not be restored to them. There was, in many points, a close resemblance between these heretics and the followers of Carpocrates and Cerinthus, who separated *Christ* from *Jesus*, and maintained that the latter was a mere man, the son of Joseph the Carpenter, born in the ordinary course of nature, into whom the Æon Christ descended from Heaven, at his baptism, and, having enabled him to perform all his miracles, and to excel other men in wisdom and virtue, departed from him at his crucifixion, and returned again to the Divine Pleroma, from whence he originally came.† The impieties and absurdities into which these Gnostics fell were so gross, that, as their heresies have long since passed away, we should not even have alluded to them, but for the purpose of showing that there is no folly too extravagant, no belief too monstrous, for those to adopt who reject the authority of Revelation, and commit themselves, in matters of pure faith, to the guidance of their unaided reason or unbridled fancy.

The Ebionites, who seem to have been the legitimate founders of the *first* Socinian school, afford another very striking illustration of the truth of this remark. These sectaries, who, because they acknowledged Jesus to be the Christ, are classed by ecclesiastical writers amongst the earlier Christian heretics, were, indeed, rather Jews than Christians; for, whilst they retained all the observances of the Mosaic law, they rejected, with this one exception, all the peculiar articles of the Christian faith. The modern Socinians, however, from Zwicker to Belsham, have persisted in maintaining, in direct opposition to all ecclesiastical history, that these Ebionites were sound members of the Apostolic Church of Jerusalem, and the sole preservers of that pure Unitarian doctrine which the apostles originally preached. To establish this point they have laboured hard to identify them with the Nazarenes, who rose, indeed, out of the ruins of the primitive Jewish Church, and truly maintained the apostolic doctrine of the divinity of Jesus

* Ignat. ad Smyrn. c. 11.

† Eriphian. Adv. Hæres. lib. i. pp. 102, 103, in Carpocrat. Cerinthus, he says, maintained the same opinions as Carpocrates in Cerinthi. prope init.

Christ.* In fact, the only error of the Nazarenes consisted in their belief that the *Jewish* converts to Christianity were still bound to the observance of the law of Moses; and their persisting in this error—an error, be it remembered, which the apostles themselves had tolerated—rendered them objects of suspicion and dislike to the Gentile Christians, who, after the total destruction of Jerusalem by the Emperor Adrian, and in consequence of the persecution they had suffered from the insurgent and fanatical Jews in the rebellion of Bar-Cochebas, were anxious to mark, as distinctly as possible, the difference between themselves and that turbulent and detested people. There is hardly any fact in the early history of the Church more clearly established than the distinction between the Nazarenes and Ebionites, and the only grounds which the Unitarians have for asserting their identity, are, first of all, a doubt of Epiphanius (who, by his own confession, knew nothing of the matter) whether the Nazarenes believed in the divinity of Jesus Christ,† which doubt they have improved, as usual, into a positive assertion that they rejected it; and, secondly, a singular assertion of Origen's, that the name of Ebionites was given, without exception, to all the Jewish Christians, who united, with the acknowledgement of Jesus as the Christ, the strict observance of the Mosaic law; they were so named, he says, on account of "*the poverty of the law*"—ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐκδοχῆν πτωχείας τοῦ νόμου γεγενημένοι.‡ But no other writer has made this assertion; and Origen himself, when he is speaking of the Ebionites, properly so called, who professed the opinions of Ebion, and denied our Lord's divinity, tells us they were so named on account of "*the poverty of their faith in Jesus*"—πτωχεύουτες περὶ τὴν εἰς Ἰησοῦν πίστιν.§ These heretics rejected all the books of the New Testament, except the Gospel of St. Matthew, of which they used a Hebrew copy, but mutilated and adulterated to make it suit their own opinions.|| The two first chapters they wholly omitted, as Mr. Belsham proposes to do, and substituted in their stead the following unauthorized introduction to the third chapter:—

"*There was a certain man, Jesus by name, and he was about thirty years old, who elected us. And he came to Capernaum, and entered into the house of Simon, who was surnamed Peter, and he opened his mouth, and said, As I passed by the lake of Tiberius I elected John and James, the sons of Ze-*

* Sulp. Sever. Sac. Hist. lib. xi. c. 45. Augustin. De Hæres. c. 9. Hieronym. Epist. LXXXIX. ad Augustinum.

† Epiphani. Adv. Hæres. lib. i. p. 123, in Nazaræos.

‡ Origen. contra Cels. lib. xi. prope init.

§ Idem, in Comment. in Matt. p. 428. Ed. Huet.

|| Irenæus, contra Hæres. lib. i. c. 26. Epiphani. Adv. Hæres. lib. i. p. 137, in Ebionæos.

*bedee, and Simon, and Andrew, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, and thee, Matthew, who was sitting at the receipt of custom, have I called, and thou hast followed me. I will, therefore, that ye should be twelve apostles, for a testimony unto Israel. And John was baptizing," &c.**

This preface to St. Matthew the Unitarians, to be consistent, ought unquestionably to adopt; and we are surprised they have so long omitted to do it. It is not improbable that the earlier Ebionites, like some of the first Socinians, ascribed to our Lord a sort of secondary and adscitious divinity; but, as error is never uniform, they soon began to differ amongst themselves in their notions respecting the person of Jesus Christ; and striking off at last into the heresy of Carpocrates, which they mixed up with the delirious reveries of Elxai, they maintained that Christ "had a sort of form resembling the human, but invisible to man, ninety-six miles in height, twenty-four in breadth, and thick in proportion; and that the Holy Spirit, in all respects of the same dimensions, stood by his side in a female form."† But enough of these models of Unitarian orthodoxy.

These were Judaizing heretics. The first Gentile Christian who asserted the mere humanity of Jesus Christ, in that gross form in which it is maintained by Priestley and his followers, was one Theodotus, a tanner of Byzantium. It is related of this person, who flourished towards the close of the second century, that, to save his life in a time of persecution, he publicly denied that he was a believer in Jesus Christ; that, in consequence of his apostasy, he was so despised and shunned by his fellow-Christians at Byzantium, that he thought it expedient to remove to Rome, where, being recognized, he boldly justified his conduct, and affirmed, that to deny Christ, who was a mere man, was no offence against God.‡ Of the previous apostasy of Theodotus there is no room to doubt, and it is certain that he began first to broach his heretical opinions at Rome, in the time of Victor, by whom he was excommunicated. His tenets were adopted by his contemporary Artemon; but though they were supported with great subtilty and erudition, they met with such small success, that Epiphanius declares he knew not whether, in his time, any of the sect were in existence. The preceding heresies had, for the most part, either grown out of the inveterate prejudices of the Jews, or the visionary systems of the oriental theology; but the

* Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* lib. i. c. 26. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæres.* lib. i. p. 137, in *Ebionæos.*

† Idem, p. 141.

‡ Idem, lib. xi. p. 463, in *Theodotianos.* Compare Tertullian, *de Præscript. Hær.* c. ult. p. 223, where he mentions the apostasy of Theodotus. Mr. Lindsey, with his accustomed accuracy, calls Theodotus a *Jewish Christian.*—*Apology*, p. 164.

doctrine of Theodotus was rather the offspring of the subtle philosophy of Greece, which attempted to explain on metaphysical principles the fundamental article of the Trinity in Unity, and to comprehend the mode in which the two natures were said to be united in the person of our blessed Saviour. To acquire credit to this novel system, the followers of Theodotus asserted, with as much confidence as the followers of Priestley assert it now, that the opinions which they maintained were originally taught by the apostles themselves, and universally professed by the primitive Christians. This fact is mentioned by Eusebius, who also tells us that the pretensions of these heretics were triumphantly confuted by an ancient author, whom he omits to name,* but from whose work he gives a very important and interesting extract.

Dr. Priestley has made so strange a use of this remarkable passage, and the manner in which he has distorted and misrepresented it affords so just a specimen of the extreme dishonesty of Unitarian commentators, that it deserves, on that account, a more close and particular attention. Eusebius himself, in introducing the subject, affirms that the heresy which taught that Christ was a mere man, though its advocates impiously and falsely asserted its antiquity, was newly brought into the Church, not long before the time in which his author wrote. He then quotes his words.

“ They maintain that all the first Christians, and the apostles themselves, received and taught those things which they [the followers of Artemon] now hold; and that the true doctrine, which was preserved till the time of Victor, the thirteenth bishop of Rome in succession from St. Peter, was first corrupted by his successor Zephyrinus. Their assertion might have some show of probability, but that, in the first place, the Holy Scriptures are directly opposed to them; and there are extant many writings of the brethren, more ancient than the times of Victor, which they wrote to the Gentiles in defence of the truth, and against the then existing heresies,—I speak of Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement, and many others,—in all of which the divinity of Christ is maintained. And who is ignorant of the books of Irenæus, Melito, and the rest, which proclaim that Christ is both God and man? And whatsoever psalms and songs were written from the first by the faithful brethren, they all ascribe divinity to Christ, and celebrate Him as the Word of God. How then,” he asks, “ can it be pretended that the doctrines which they [the Artemonites] inculcate, were received till the time of Victor? And how is it that they are not ashamed to throw out this calumny against him, since they perfectly well know that Victor excommunicated Theodotus, the inventor and father of their God-denying apostasy, the first who asserted the mere humanity of Christ.”†

* The author, as we learn from Photius, in *Bibliotheca*, c. 48, was the presbyter Caius.

† Euseb. H. E. lib. v. c. 28.

Here is enough to convince a reasonable man, that from the first promulgation of Christianity, to the end of the second or the commencement of the third century, when these observations were written, the doctrine of our Saviour's proper Godhead was universally received amongst the faithful; and that the *αἵρεσις ἀρνησιθεοῦς*, the heresy which denied his divinity, had never been heard of in the Church of Rome, till it was first brought there by Theodotus the tanner. It will probably appear to every unprejudiced mind, that a more decisive and unexceptionable testimony to the apostolicity and universal reception of the doctrine of our Lord's divinity can hardly be imagined, than that which is contained in this remarkable sentence: *Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσσι ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ ὙΜΝΟΥΣΙ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΥΝΤΕΣ*. These psalms and sacred songs of the primitive Christians are lost; but the assertion of Caius, that they "*celebrated the Godhead of Christ, the Word of God,*" is confirmed by the well-known epistle of Pliny to Trajan,* in which he informs the Emperor, that he found, by the confession of certain renegades, that the Christians "*were accustomed to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and to sing a hymn alternately to CHRIST AS GOD; carmenque CHRISTO, QUASI DEO, dicere secum invicem.*" But Dr. Priestley could perceive nothing in this passage of Eusebius, but a plain *acknowledgement* "that the ancient Unitarians themselves constantly asserted, that their doctrine was the universal opinion of the primitive Church till the time of Victor."† Ancient Unitarians! Why Eusebius himself expressly asserts, that the impious doctrine of these sectaries was newly introduced by Theodotus, and, in confirmation of his assertion, appeals to a writer of that day, who irresistibly confuted their claim to apostolical antiquity! But, with a still bolder disregard of truth, Dr. Priestley affirmed of Eusebius, whom he ignorantly confounded with the presbyter Caius, that, "in refuting their pretensions to antiquity, he goes no farther back than Irenæus and Justin Martyr."‡ And how did Dr. Priestley know that the Clement to whom Caius appeals was not Clement of Rome, a contemporary of the apostles? The ancient writers, to whose testimony Caius refers, were all older than the time of Victor; and it may be necessary to inform the Unitarian polemic, that Clement of Alexandria survived him. But let that pass. Were the *ψαλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσσι*, "the hymns that were written by the faithful from the very beginning of the Church," of no greater antiquity

* Plin. Epist. lib. x. Ep. 97, ad Trajan.

† Hist. of Corrupt. vol. xi. p. 486.

‡ Idem, vol. i. p. 19.

than the days of Justin? In the *Philopatris*, a satirical dialogue ascribed to Lucian, but probably the work of some contemporary writer, Triphion, a Christian, in reply to the question of his Heathen catechumen, "By whom shall I swear?" answers, Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεόν, μέγαν, ἀμβροτον, οὐρανίωνα, υἷον πατρὸς, πνεῦμα ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἘΝ ΕΚ ΤΡΙΩΝ, ΚΑΙ ΕΞ ἘΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΑ, ταῦτα νόμιξε Ζῆνα, τὸν δὲ ἡγοῦ Θεόν.* This passage almost persuaded Socinus that the doctrine of the Trinity was the received belief of the Christians of the second century; and one should think that the mention, by a writer of that century, of the ancient hymns of the faithful, in which "the divinity of Christ, the Word of God, was celebrated from the beginning," confirmed as it is by the unexceptionable testimony of Pliny, would convince any but a Socinian that the primitive Christians worshipped him as God; or if any further confirmation of the doctrine contained in these sacred songs were wanting, he would find it in the futile attempt of Paul of Samosata to abolish the use of them in his Church.†

This heretic, who endeavoured for a while to revive the expiring tenets of Theodotus and Artemon, and of whom it is hard to say, whether his arrogance or his impiety were the greatest, asserted the mere humanity of Christ; and had the unparalleled effrontery to introduce into his own Church at Antioch hymns to his own honour, in lieu of those which had formerly been chaunted in honour of the Son of God.‡ This heresy, however, was so completely crushed by the council of Antioch, A. D. 270, that, till Socinus himself appeared, no further attempts deserving of notice were made from this quarter to corrupt the Catholic doctrine. There was, indeed, an obscure and singular sect, which sprung up in Lombardy during the twelfth century, known by the name of Pasaginians, who seem to have adopted the exploded opinions of Ebion, and maintained, that the Law of Moses was obligatory upon all Christians, and that Christ himself was no more than the first and the purest creature of God.§ But this contemptible heresy expired almost in its birth, and the very origin of its name is unknown.

At the Reformation, however, whilst those who were most eminent for piety and learning employed themselves to correct the abuses which had crept into the faith and practice of the Western Church; others, who were fond of extremes, and apt, as such

* Luciani Opp. vol. iii. p. 596. Ed. Wetsten.

† Epist. Synod. Antioch. contra Paulum, apud Euseb. H. E. lib. vii. c. 30.

‡ Idem.

§ Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. Cent. XII. c. 5. s. 14.

persons commonly are, to mistake reverse of wrong for right, persuaded themselves, that whatever had been taught by the Church of Rome must necessarily be erroneous; and not content with removing the "wood, hay, and stubble," with which the edifice was overlaid, thought the work of reformation would be incomplete, unless they demolished the foundation on which the whole fabric rested. It was not enough for them to reject those pretended articles of faith, which had nothing better to rest on than mere church-authority, and of which some were directly contrary both to reason and Scripture; but, together with these, they renounced almost every thing which had been sanctioned by the authority of the universal church, from the first promulgation of the Christian faith; and disputed against every doctrine, which, how clearly soever delivered in the Gospel, was above the comprehension of the human mind. Amongst these, the fundamental doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, were, of course, the chief. As early as the year 1524 both these tenets were openly impugned by one Hetzer, and other heretics, who were too inconsiderable to form any permanent sects, and to resist the combined efforts of the Roman Catholics and Protestants to suppress them. It was reserved to Faustus Socinus, a man, it is confessed, of little learning, but of great genius, and inflexible resolution, to give the Unitarian system an air of coherence and consistency, which it had hitherto wanted. He defended himself with much dexterity and art against all his opponents; and, by a crafty concealment of his most offensive doctrines, obtained to his sect many converts, who would have been shocked, at the outset, by an open and ingenuous declaration of his real opinions. With this design he employed his utmost efforts to suppress the faction of Francis Davides, the superintendant of his Transylvanian congregations, who vehemently opposed the worship of Jesus Christ; and herein he acted, not from a sincere conviction of the pernicious tendency of this god-denying heresy, but from the dread of incurring the odium of all other Christians by too early an avowal of his participation in it. For the only error imputed by him to Davides, was his affirming, that all worship should be directed immediately to God; and, consequently, that to worship Christ, who was a mere creature, was unlawful and idolatrous. The dispute which was carried on between Socinus and other leaders of the Unitarian party, on this subject, is not without interest; and those who desire fuller information upon it, and have no opportunity of consulting the works of Socinus, and perusing his controversy with Davides, and that with Frankenius, *De Adoratione Christi*, will find it unanswerably proved by Mosheim in his *History of the*

Socinians,* and by Bishop Bull in his *Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio de Divinitate Jesu Christi*,† that Socinus himself secretly entertained the same opinions with Davides, at the very time when, for his openly professing them, he procured him to be thrown into that prison in which he ended his days.

But we pass from his conduct to his tenets. It was the fundamental principle of Socinus, that nothing which is above the comprehension of human reason is to be admitted as an article of faith: and, in matters of religion, he would have appealed to Scripture only; totally rejecting the authority of the Fathers, and the uninterrupted tradition of the church, as *means* for ascertaining the sense of Scripture on disputed points. From which two principles it inevitably follows, that whatever doctrine any person sees, or thinks he sees, in Scripture, must be to him an article of faith; and consequently, that to different individuals the rule of faith must be different, according to their respective acquirements, or the different capacities and powers of their minds. Thus, in his disputation with Frankenius, on the "Adoration of Christ," he thought it sufficient to say, "*De veritate meæ sententiæ tam sum certus, quàm certò scio me istum pileum manibus tenere;*" to which very satisfactory argument Frankenius smartly replied, "*Tua ista certitudo non potest mihi et aliis esse veritatis regula; nam reperietur alius quispiam, qui dicat, sententiam tuæ contrariam ex sacris literis sibi esse persuasissimam.*"‡ He might have made his answer yet stronger; for, with whatever clearness or fullness any tenet might be delivered in Scripture, had it appeared contrary to his own reason, Socinus had been bound to reject it. Thus, having satisfied himself, that it was a metaphysical impossibility that there should be a Trinity of persons in the Unity of the Godhead, or that the divine and human natures should be united in the person of Jesus Christ, he either explained away the literal expressions of Scripture, and interpreted in a figurative sense all those passages, in which the most exalted titles and attributes of the Godhead are ascribed to our blessed Lord; or at once fairly impugned the inspiration and authority of the sacred writers. It is evident, in fact, that the Unitarians made their last appeal, not to Scripture, but to reason; and think themselves at liberty to employ such violence in disturbing the inspired word, and wresting it to their own purposes, as to render it perfectly useless as a rule of faith. Of the absurdity and mischievous tendency of the Socinian principles of Scripture interpretation a more unprejudiced witness than the sceptic Bayle can hardly be required.

* Eccles. Hist. Cent. XVI. s. 3. Part II. c. 4. and especially in a note of the Translator's.

† Chap. VI. ss. 11, 12, 13, 14.

‡ Idem.

“The most general objection,” he tells us, “raised against the Socinians, is, that by refusing to believe what they think contrary to philosophical truths, and by denying the unconceivable mysteries of the Christian religion, they open a way to Scepticism, Deism, and Atheism. Perhaps it might be objected to them, that they do the same, at least indirectly, by their way of explaining the passages of Scripture, which concern the consubstantiality of the Word. For it seems to follow from their explanations, that the Apostles, being animated with an ardent zeal for the glory of Jesus Christ, made use of the most strained figures and expressions which devotion can suggest, when they spoke of his perfections. Thus the votaries of the Holy Virgin have carried it as high, and as near a true and real deification as ever they could. But if the expressions of the Apostles were to be ascribed to an enthusiastic zeal, and not to the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, it is plain the Scriptures would be of little more authority than the panegyrics upon the saints. But by overthrowing the inspiration of the sacred writers, the whole Revelation comes to nothing, and then every thing will be a mere philosophical dispute.”*

The modern Unitarians, who have carried their audacity, in this respect, to the utmost height, appear, in the judgment of many unprejudiced persons, to have small claim to the appellation of Christians. When Dr. Priestley boldly declares, “I do not see that we are under any obligation to believe it (the doctrine of Christ having made the world) merely because it was an opinion of an apostle;”† when the authors of the “*Improved Version*,” in defiance of all the MSS. and versions extant, and in defiance of the concurrent testimony of the ancient church, reject the commencement of St. Matthew’s gospel, from v. 17 of the first to the end of the second chapter, and from v. 5. of the first to the end of the second chapter of St. Luke, on the ground that “some of the facts have a *fabulous appearance*, and the reasoning, from the prophecies of the Old Testament, is *inconclusive*;” when the present minister of Essex Street Chapel speaks of the great Apostle of the Gentiles in the most unmeasured terms of contempt and reprimand, and accuses him of ignorance and folly;‡ we pause to reflect from what manner of men these bold asser-

* Bayle, Dict. Article, Socinus.

† Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. i. p. 163. quoted by Mr. Burton, p. 53.

‡ This is a graver charge, and requires to be proved. Take these few instances, which might be multiplied without end. “The Apostle,” says Mr. Belsham, “does not say that he was inspired to assert the literal truth of the Mosaic history of the Fall: probably he knew no more of it than we do.”—*Translations of St. Paul’s Epistles*, vol. i. p. 110.

“Such no doubt was the Apostle’s meaning, if he had any meaning at all.” Id. p. 171.

And in a note on the Epistles to the Hebrews, he coolly remarks, the Apostle’s “mode of reasoning is evidently inconclusive, and in the present enlightened age is altogether discarded!!”

tions proceed; we ask whether the most avowed infidel has ever surpassed them in their undisguised attempts to vilify the sacred penman, and to overthrow the inspiration and authority of Scripture; and we listen with indignation and surprise to their confident assertion, that the Apostles themselves, and all the apostolic Fathers, were strict Unitarians;* that the whole primitive church constantly maintained the self-same doctrines which the Socinians now profess; and that, "from the days of Constantine to the present times, those called *heretics* have generally been the honest few who have ventured to search the Holy Scriptures for themselves, and openly profess the truth of God which they there learned, in opposition to popular error." This very simple assertion may be accepted as a candid acknowledgment of the Unitarians themselves to what class of Christians they belong; but it is really wonderful, that any man, or any set of men, can have the face to affirm, so long as the works of Bishop Bull are in existence, that all the Fathers of the Church, and all Christian people, till the Council of Nice, were Unitarians. This is a mere question of fact, to be decided by a reference to their writings, a question, which, as every person with the smallest pretensions to theological learning perfectly well knows, has been unanswerably decided against the Socinians: for not only has it been shown by Bishop Bull, in his three celebrated treatises, the *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, the *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicæ*, and the *Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio*, that every one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, without exception, has asserted the divinity of Jesus Christ, but there is not a single argument of Zuicker and Episcopius, which is not triumphantly confuted by him; nor is there a single argument of Priestley, Lindsey, or Belsham worth noticing, which has not been borrowed from those defeated writers. It was with reason, therefore, that Bishop Horsley, in his controversy with Dr. Priestley, declined going over this beaten ground; and confined himself to the task of exposing the utter incompetency and the gross misrepresentations of his opponent. They who are less acquainted with polemical theology, and are strangers to the works of Pearson, Bull and Waterland, will find

These are but a very few samples of Mr. Belsham's irreverent and flippant censure of St. Paul; in all which, however, he is but a bold imitator of Dr. Priestley, who says in the same strain, "I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively."—*History of Corruptions*, vol. ii. p. 370.

* "The doctrine of our Lord's mere humanity is the clear doctrine of the Scriptures, and the Apostles never taught any other."—*Priestley's Hist. of Corrup.* vol. i. p. 6.

"It is absolutely necessary that the less learned should be told, what upon inquiry will be found to be undeniably true, viz. that the Fathers of the first three centuries, and consequently all Christian people, for upwards of three hundred years after Christ, till the Council of Nice, were generally Unitarians."—*Lindsey's Apology*, p. 23, 24. N. B. the italics are his own.

it proved by Mr. Burton in the present work, and proved past controversy, that all the Fathers of the three first centuries maintained the catholic doctrine of our Saviour's proper Godhead.

The arrangement and method of the work are, we are disposed to think, the best that could have been adopted. Instead of dividing the testimonies of the Fathers to the Godhead of Christ under distinct heads, as Bishop Bull has done in his *Defence of the Nicene Faith*, and classing separately under their respective titles the passages which treat of his Pre-existence, his Consubstantiality, his Co-eternity, and his Subordination to the Father, Mr. Burton appeals to each writer in chronological order, and extracts from their respective works, as they stand in the best editions, those passages, which directly assert the Divinity of Christ. Of the passages which bear more remotely on this doctrine, and those in which it is only indirectly implied, he has omitted hundreds, or perhaps thousands; and those which speak of his human nature, and his inferiority to the Father, he has omitted altogether. The work being designed for general readers, the quotations are all given in English, as literally as the idiom of the language will permit; but the original is always annexed at the bottom of the page. A brief account of the life of every Father is prefixed to the notice of his writings; for which account the author professes himself to be generally indebted to Lardner. With the quotations are frequently interspersed remarks to explain the original, and to point out from the context the conclusions at which the writer aims. These parts of the work will frequently be found of great value to the scholar and biblical critic, and will impart to it its highest interest in the estimation of the general reader. Instead of contenting himself with a dry extract from the works of each Father, as they succeed one another in the order of time, he frequently takes occasion to illustrate the passage immediately before him; or to expose the sophistries and mistatements of the modern Unitarians; or to defend the integrity, authenticity and inspiration of the Sacred Text from the rash assaults of these nominal Christians, by a copious collation of the opinions of other Fathers, and a wide excursion into the fields of theological criticism. The want of something of this kind was, perhaps, the greatest defect in the Bishop of Lincoln's *Analysis of Tertullian*. With respect to Mr. Burton's omission of those passages of the Fathers, in which it is asserted, that Christ was partaker of our human nature, and that he was inferior to the Father, though both these doctrines are maintained by the Masters of our Israel, and have always been acknowledged by the Catholic Church, it is sufficient to observe, that the notice of them did not properly fall within the scope of his work; which is,

simply to adduce the testimonies in support of our Lord's *Divinity*. On the other hand, no person of the smallest judgment will quote these passages in support of the Unitarian doctrine. Ten thousand such passages would not prove that the writers of them were not sound Trinitarians; but one single passage in any writer, in which the proper Godhead of Christ is fully and distinctly affirmed, affords an irresistible proof, that that writer was not an Unitarian. For, as Mr. Burton well remarks,

“ If it be proved satisfactorily, that the Fathers believed in the eternity and consubstantial divinity of the Son, the Unitarian notion of his mere humanity is necessarily overthrown. For there is this great difference between the creed of the Unitarians and that of the Catholic Church, so far as they are affected by the testimonies of the Fathers: the divinity of Christ, according to the catholic sense of the doctrine, is not disproved by passages which support his human nature; but *the simple humanity* of Christ is altogether overthrown by passages which assert his divinity.”—*Introduction*, pp. xiv. xv.

Bearing this observation in mind, we would wish our readers to consider the following passage of Lactantius, who flourished A. D. 310. Being of small reputation amongst the orthodox, he is, of course, of great authority amongst the Unitarians, who claim him for their own with marvellous complacency. With what reason the ensuing extract, which we give in Mr. Burton's translation, will show.

“ Perhaps some one may ask, how, when we say that we worship one God, we yet assert that there are two Gods, God the Father, and God the Son: which assertion has driven many into the greatest error: who, although what we say seems to be probable, yet think that we fail in this one point, that we acknowledge a second and a mortal God. Concerning his mortality we have already spoken: let us now explain his unity. When we speak of God the Father, and God the Son, we do not speak of a different God, nor do we separate both; because neither can the Father be without the Son, nor the Son be separated from the Father: since, indeed, neither can the Father have His name without the Son, nor can the Son be begotten without the Father. Since, therefore, the Father makes the Son, and the Son the Father, both have one mind, one spirit, one substance. Wherefore, since the mind and will of one is in the other, or rather there is one in both, both are properly called one God; because whatever is in the Father passes to the Son, and whatever is in the Son descends from the Father. The supreme and only God, therefore, cannot be worshipped except through the Son. He who thinks that he worships the Father only, as he does not worship the Son, also does not worship the Father. But he who receives the Son, and bears his name, together with the Son worships the Father also.”—*Instit.* lib. iv. c. 29.

How inaccurately soever Lactantius may sometimes have ex-

pressed himself, respecting the generation of the Son, and his subordination to the Father, this is certainly not the language of a Socinian, nor even of an Arian. And if Lactantius is taken from them, there is not one Father left to whom the Unitarians can make the smallest claim. We shall proceed, however, to examine the validity of some of their pretensions, and to point out some of the gross mistakes, and still grosser misrepresentations, which they have made in citing the authority of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. In so doing, we shall confine ourselves strictly to those instances of ignorance and unfairness, which are pointed out by Mr. Burton in the work before us. Those of our readers who are acquainted with the writings of the modern Unitarians, will know how easily we might double the number.

We begin with the assertion of Dr. Whitby,—a man not uninformed in the writings of the Fathers,—that Clement of Rome “constantly separates Jesus Christ from that God whom he styles the true and only God, but never once calls him God.”* What truth there is in this assertion our readers may judge, after they have considered the following quotation from his first Epistle.

“Ye have all been humble-minded, arrogant in nothing, subjected rather than subjecting, giving rather than receiving, being satisfied with the supplies sent from God: and paying careful attention to His words, ye have fixed them deeply in your minds, and His sufferings were before your eyes.† The person, whose words and sufferings had made such an impression upon them, is said to be God: and it is equally evident that the sufferings were those of Jesus Christ, who was therefore considered by Clement to be God.”—p. 9.

We come next to Dr. Priestley, the modern coryphæus of the sect; and shall notice, first, what Mr. Burton calls his “presumptuous falsehood,”‡ that “the genuineness of the writings of Ignatius is generally given up by the learned.” There are two editions of the seven epistles of this apostolic Father, a longer and a shorter. The phraseology of the longer edition sometimes favours the Arian notions; the shorter is everywhere conformable to the Catholic doctrine. This edition has the suffrage of the Fathers of the five first centuries; their quotations, which are numerous, everywhere agreeing with its text; and it was believed by Isaac Vossius, Usher, Hammond, Petavius, Grotius, Pearson, Bull, Cave, Wake, Cotelerius, Grabe, Dupin, Tillemont, Le Clerc to exhibit the genuine text.§ Whether Dr.

* Reply to Waterland, p. 11,

† “Πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονεύμενοι — τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρκούμενοι, καὶ προσέχοντες τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς ἐσπερτισμένοι ἥτε τοῖς σπλάγχθοις, καὶ τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἦν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν.”

‡ Page 14.

§ Vide Bishop Horsley's Fifth Letter to Dr. Priestley.

Priestley would have allowed these men to be *learned*, we know not; but as he wrote his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* without ever perusing the celebrated works of Bishop Bull, we strongly suspect, that, when he made this rash assertion, he was equally unacquainted with the writings of those other great divines, whose names Bishop Horsley furnished for his instruction. Had he ever studied, instead of *looking through*, as his manner was, the *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* of Bishop Pearson, a work unanswerable and unanswered, he might possibly have escaped the severe castigation which Horsley inflicted on his temerity.

Before we quit the writings of Ignatius, we would request our readers to notice the following words in the title of the Epistle to the Ephesians:—"Ignatius—to the Church of Ephesus—which was pre-ordained before the worlds—according to the will of the Father, and of *Jesus Christ our God*."* The Epistle begins thus:

"I approve in God of the much-beloved name which ye have justly obtained, by faith and love in Jesus Christ our Saviour. Being imitators of God, having animated yourselves by the blood of God, ye have performed perfectly the congenial work."†

On this passage Mr. Burton remarks, that

"the *blood of God* is certainly a very strong expression; but it was not unusual with the Fathers: and seems to afford an additional confirmation of the received reading in Acts xx. 28: '*Feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with his own blood.*'"

Instead of Θεοῦ, *God*, some MSS. and other authorities read Κυρίου, *Lord*, or Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, *Lord and God*. The Unitarian translators in their *Improved Version*, p. 331, say that "the received text rests upon the authority of no MS. of note or value." The Vatican MS., which is, perhaps, the most ancient and the highest authority of all, has Θεοῦ, *God*; and, according to Mr. Burton, this is also the reading of the oldest Syriac version, which is supposed to have been made early in the second century, if not in the end of the first. Griesbach, however, says that only the "Philoxeniana Syriaca, seculo demum sexto confecta,"‡ has this reading, and that even this edition has Κυριοῦ in the margin. But what will go far to determine the true reading, is the remark, "that the expression *Church of God* occurs in not fewer than eleven passages of St. Paul's Epistles; whereas the phrase *Church of the Lord* occurs nowhere in the New Testament."

* Ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.—Ignat. ad Eph. c. i.

† Ἀποδεξάμενος ἐν Θεῷ τὸ πολυαγάπητον σου ὄνομα ὃ κέκτησθε φύσει δικαίᾳ, κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν μιμηταὶ ὄντες Θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρσάντες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ, τὸ συγγενικὸν ἔργον τελείως ἀληθεύσατε.

‡ Nov. Test. vol. ii. p. 114, col. 2, three lines from the bottom. Ed. Loudini, 1810.

The Unitarian translators, however, assert, that the expression “*the blood of God*” is not quoted by the earliest ecclesiastical writers.” In reply to this gross misstatement Mr. Burton, pp. 20, 21, quotes Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria, who all have used the phrase. The passages from Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Dionysius we will subjoin in a note, for they are short.*

“There is, however, one passage quoted from a Post-Nicene Father, which, though, it does not properly come within the scope of this work, may be noticed here, because, if the quotation were admitted, we could scarcely entertain a doubt but that the expression *blood of God* was nowhere to be found in the Scriptures. In a note to the *Improved Version* it is said, that ‘the expression *the blood of God* is rejected with horror by Athanasius, as an invention of the Arians:’ and we may understand the author of this note the better by referring to Mr. Belsham’s ‘*Calm Inquiry*,’ published in 1817. At p. 141 of that work he has the following passage: ‘Our Scriptures, says Athanasius, nowhere mention the blood of God. Such impudent expressions are only used by Arians:’ and in the note he gives the original thus: ‘Ὀὐδαμοῦ ἐξ αἵμα Θεοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς παραδείωκασιν αἱ γραφαί· Ἀρειάνων τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμήματα. Athanas. contra Apollin. apud Wetstein. in loc.’ This seems very strong and very decisive. But Mr. Belsham had better have looked into the work of Athanasius than have copied from Wetstein. It is true that Wetstein, in his edition of the New Testament, does give the quotation in these words; but it is also true that they are *not the words of Athanasius*. Wetstein inserted καθ’ ἡμᾶς from his own head, and left out the words εἶχα σαρκός, upon which the whole meaning of the passage turns. In the Greek of Athanasius it is thus: Οὐδαμοῦ ἐξ αἵμα Θεοῦ εἶχα σαρκός παραδείωκασιν αἱ γραφαί, ἢ Θεὸν εἶχα σαρκός πάθοντα καὶ ἀναστάντα Ἀρειάνων τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμήματα; which means in English, (Mr. Belsham will pardon my translating it,) ‘*The Scriptures nowhere speak of the blood of God without flesh:*’ i. e. without adding something which implies the incarnation of God; ‘*nor of God suffering and rising again without flesh: they are Arians who venture to use such expressions.*’ Mr. Belsham was probably not aware that this work of Athanasius was written against the Apollinarian heretics, who nearly resembled the Sabellians and Patripassians, and held that God, not as united to man, but in his own unmixed essential deity, suffered on the cross and died. Athanasius, therefore, asserts in this book, that the Scriptures never speak of Jesus suffering as *God*, but in his *human nature*; or, as he says in the passage misquoted by Mr. Belsham, that ‘the Scriptures never speak of the blood of God, without mentioning or implying his flesh:’ and my readers will hardly believe, that in the very next sentence he goes on to

* Δυνάμει Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ αἵματι Θεοῦ παιδός.—Clem. Alex. Quis Dives Salvetur? c. xxxiv. p. 954. Ed. Potter.

Quod sciam, non sumus nostri, sed pretio empti: et quali pretio? Sanguine Dei.—Tertull. ad Uxorem, lib. ii. 3. p. 168. Ed. Priorii, Paris.

Ὁ φθαρτὸν τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὕτε ἀνθρώπου καθ’ ἡμᾶς θηητοῦ, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. c. Paul. Samos. Quæst. iv. p. 237. Ed. Romæ, 1796.

say—‘ but the Holy Scriptures speaking of God in the flesh, and of the flesh of God when he became man, do mention *the blood*, and sufferings, and resurrection of the body of God:’ αἱ δὲ ἅγλαι γραφαὶ ἐν σαρκὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σαρκὸς Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου αἷμα καὶ πάθος καὶ ἀνάστασιν κηρύττουσι σώματος Θεοῦ. So much for the accuracy of Mr. Belsham’s quotation, and for the assertion of the Unitarian translators, that the expression ‘ *the blood of God* is rejected with horror by Athanasius!’ to which I may add, that Athanasius himself quotes the passage from Acts, xx. 28. more than once, and expressly reads *the Church of God.*”—pp. 18—20.

All this is excellent. We have only to observe in addition, that Griesbach has followed Wetstein in this assertion: “ Patres nonnulli, et inter hos vel ipse Athanasius c. Apollinar., in sacris literis αἷμα Θεοῦ legi negarent;”* and that the assertion of the Unitarian translators, that αἷμα Θεοῦ is not quoted by the earlier writers, is the production of Mr. Belsham’s own brain; for Wetstein and Griesbach both allow that the expression is frequently used by them.

We return again to Dr. Priestley, and shall now consider some of his false assertions respecting Justin Martyr. And first he says in his *History of Corruptions*, “ we find nothing like divinity ascribed to Jesus Christ before Justin Martyr;”† and that he is “ the first writer who mentions the miraculous conception.”‡ The falsehood of the first of these assertions is directly proved by the passages extracted from the first Epistle of Clement of Rome; in his second Epistle the divinity of our Lord is asserted in the plainest terms; but as the genuineness of this epistle has been questioned, Mr. Burton has forborne to appeal to it. There are other passages, however, in the writings of Barnabas and Hermas, which clearly evince what were the sentiments of those apostolic Fathers on this point; and the testimony of Ignatius is full and unequivocal. He asserts also, in the plainest terms, the virginity of Mary, our Lord’s mother, which, he says, “ was unknown to the Prince of this world;”§ and alludes to the star which appeared at the birth of Christ, which shows that he believed the beginning of St. Matthew’s Gospel to be genuine. To this testimony of Ignatius, Dr. Priestley would, perhaps, have replied, that the authenticity of his epistles was generally given up by *the learned*; but the falsehood of this remark we have already shown.

“ But one of the most daring assertions ever uttered,” as Mr. Burton indignantly observes, p. 30, “ is made by Dr. Priestley in another place,||

* Nov. Test. vol. ii. p. 116, col. 2, l. 6.

† Vol. i. p. 32.

‡ Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. iv. p. 107.

§ Ep. ad Eph. c. xix.

|| Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. iv. p. 13.

where, speaking of the miraculous conception, he represents Justin Martyr as saying to a Jew, 'that he was at full liberty to think as he should see reason to do on that subject; and that he might be as good a Christian as the Ebionites were before him, though he should believe no more of the miraculous conception than they had done.' This is an entire invention. Justin, throughout his Dialogue with Trypho, never makes any concession of the kind; on the contrary, he frequently insists on the miraculous conception as a necessary article of belief. References to the passages may be found in the note.*—pp. 30, 31.

We come now to a very striking instance of Dr. Priestley's incompetency and unfairness in translating a celebrated passage in the Dialogue with Trypho, which Mr. Burton has pointed out in a note, p. 40. The passage itself is introduced by this remark from the Jew:

"I have heard your opinion upon these matters; resume the argument, therefore, where you left it off, and finish it: for he (Jesus Christ) seems to me to be an extraordinary kind of person, and one that cannot be defined at all. For as to what you say, that this Christ had a previous existence, being God before the worlds; that he then endured even to become a man, and to be born; and that he is not a man born of a man, this appears to me not only extraordinary, but absurd."†

In his reply to this objection, Justin acknowledges, that some who called themselves Christians, held Christ to be a mere man. "With them," says he, according to Dr. Priestley's version, "I do not agree, nor should I do so, though ever so many, being of the same opinion, should urge it upon me;"‡ but afterwards he corrects his own translation, and gives this as the *most literal* rendering: "Neither do I agree with the majority of Christians, who may have objected to my opinion."§ Of these two translations the first is to the last degree inaccurate; the second a wilful and gross misrepresentation of Justin's meaning. In downright palpable ignorance of the original, Mr. Lindsey appears to have surpassed Dr. Priestley in his version of this passage, almost as much as he surpassed him in sincerity and candour. This is Mr. Lindsey's attempt at translation:

"Although I shall not prove Christ to be God, otherwise than by proving that this is the Christ, and that it was foretold he should be so. Yet it will be just that thou shouldst believe me deceived in that one point, and yet not deny that this is the Christ, *though he seem to be a man born of men*, and said to be chosen to be the Christ."

This incoherent and unintelligible nonsense Mr. Lindsey would

* Dial. cum Tryph. c. 43. p. 133, &c.; c. 63. p. 160; c. 66. p. 163; c. 75. p. 172; c. 76. p. 173; c. 84. p. 181.

† Dial. cum Tryph. c. 43. p. 113.

‡ Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. iii. p. 279.

§ Idem, p. 283.

fain persuade *the less learned* to be a literal translation of Justin. He then proceeds:

“For there are some friends of mine amongst us [Christians] who profess him to be the Christ, but affirm him to be a man born of men; with whom, however, I do not agree, nor will any so speak who are of the same opinion with me.”*

The only point which Mr. Lindsey seems to have understood in this passage, is, that Justin here alludes to the opinion of the Ebionites, who held our Saviour Christ to have been only the son of Joseph and Mary—an opinion which Mr. Lindsey, inadvertently we presume, censures as a manifest error. We will now give the original, and, as we are not disposed altogether to adopt even Mr. Burton’s version of the passage, shall annex our own translation of it. Καὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ τινες, ὡ φίλοι, ἔλεγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους (Mr. Lindsey renders these words, “there are some friends of mine among us Christians”) ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποφαινόμενοι· οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι· οὐδ’ ἂν πλείστοι, ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες, εἴποιεν. We quote from the Paris edition of 1636, p. 267, in which the reading ταῦτα is greatly preferable to that of the Benedictines, ταῦτα; and it is remarkable that Bishop Bull, who read ταῦτα, translates the passage “*eadem* mecum sentientes.”† We would also propose, with Bull and other eminent critics, to read ἡμετέρου instead of ἡμετέρου. The reasons for this correction are almost self-evident; for Justin never uses the phrase ἡμέτερον γένος, or γένος ἡμῶν, *our nation*, to denote the Christian community at large; and, in fact, the phrase so applied would be palpably absurd: but he frequently employs it, in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, to describe the Jewish people. Thus, in the sentence which immediately precedes the passage before us, he speaks to him of the Jews, as οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν, “*those of your nation* ;” and in the foregoing page, as οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἡμετέρου πιστεύειν λέγοντες ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν Χριστόν, “*those of your nation who say they believe in Christ*,” where it is evident he is speaking of the Ebionites. And of them, in contradistinction to the other Jewish Christians, he unquestionably speaks in the passage we are now considering, and which we would thus translate:

“For there are some, my friends, of your nation, who confess him to be Christ, but declare that he was a man born of men; with whom I do not agree: neither would the majority, [of Jewish Christians,] who hold the same opinion with me, say so.”

Here then we have a declaration of Justin’s, and, as far as the Unitarian controversy is concerned, a very important one, that the majority of the Jewish Christians were *not* Unitarians, but pro-

* Lindsey’s Apology, p. 160, note.

† Judicium Eccles. Catholicæ, c. vii. p. 513.

fessed the same opinions with himself, and believed, like him, in the divinity, the pre-existence, and the miraculous conception of our Lord: ὅτι καὶ προῦπήρχεν υἱὸς τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων, Θεὸς ὢν, καὶ γεγένηται ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου.* Yet this very declaration has Dr. Priestley distorted into an acknowledgement on the part of Justin, that the majority of Christians differed from him in their opinions respecting the divinity of Christ, and into a preposterous determination that he would still adhere to his own peculiar sentiments, in opposition to the general voice of the Church.

That those who believed in the proper Godhead of Christ would also regard him as the proper object of worship, and direct their prayers to him, we might with certainty have concluded, even had we possessed no direct evidence on the subject; as, on the other hand, had we found, from the writings of the earlier Christians, that they worshipped him, we should necessarily have inferred that they believed him to be God. The opinion and practice of Christians in the second century, respecting the worship of Christ, may be learnt from many passages in Justin Martyr, Melito, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian; to these may be added, at a later period, Origen, Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, and lastly Arnobius, who all assert that Christ is to be worshipped as "*the first-born of every creature, who is his word, and God.*"† These are the very words of Origen, and yet Dr. Priestley,‡ and his follower Mr. Lindsey,§ adduce the testimony of Origen to prove that, in his time, the worship of Christ was unknown to Christians. For full satisfaction on this subject we refer our readers to No. 25 of Mr. Burton's work, under the head Justin Martyr; and to No. 73, under the head Clement of Alexandria.

In page 51 Mr. Burton notices the false assertion of a Socinian writer, Dr. Whitby, that "the titles of τοῦ παντός ποιητῆς, and τῶν ὅλων δημιουργός, were such as the writers of the second century always distinguished the Father from the Son by." This, as he remarks, is an unfounded statement: and he quotes Justin Martyr to prove it so. "God," says that Father, "made a special revelation of His will to mankind, not, as one might suppose, by sending to men any of His servants, either an angel, or a prince, or one of those who administer the affairs of earth, or one of those who have the management of heavenly things entrusted to them—ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων—but the Framer and Creator of the Universe himself, by whom He created the heavens, by whom He shut up the sea in its own bounds."|| This is

* Dial. cum Tryph. p. 267. Ed. Paris.

† Origen contra Cels. lib. vii. c. ult.

‡ Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. i. p. 37.

§ Apology, p. 142.

|| Epist. ad Diognetum, c. 7.

very satisfactory; Justin expressly calls the Son, δημιουργὸν τῶν ὄλων: and in another passage he shows, that, in his opinion, the title δημιουργός, was strictly applicable to the Son only: "For the Maker, ποιητής, makes that which is made of his own might and power, without requiring the aid of any thing else; but the Creator, δημιουργός, having received the power of creation from matter, arranges that which is created."* Other Fathers, however, have styled the Son ποιητής and δημιουργός indifferently. Thus Irenæus three times calls Him Maker of all things, ποιητήν; and in one passage accumulates all these titles upon Him, calling Him "Framer, Creator, and Maker of all things."† Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Gregory of Neocæsarea, and Dionysius of Alexandria are also quoted by Mr. Burton, No. 37, as applying the titles of Creator, δημιουργός, and God the Creator, to the Son. To these we may add Theophilus of Antioch, a Father of the second century, whose testimony to the divinity of Christ, though it is precise and positive, Mr. Burton has omitted to notice. His three books "Ad Autolyicum" are unquestionably genuine. In the second he more than once asserts, that the Word is the second person in the Divine Trinity; and also, that he is the Lord of the Universe, which was created by him. Τοῦτον τὸν λογὸν [ὁ Θεὸς] ἔχεν ὑπουργὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένων, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν. Οὗτος λέγεται ἀρχὴ, ὅτι ἀρχεῖ καὶ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ δεδημιουργημένων.‡

Our translation of Hebrews, i. 2. "by whom also He made the worlds," is strongly confirmed by the expressions of Justin, ᾧ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἔκτισεν.

"The Improved Version translates this 'for whom also he constituted the ages,' which perhaps does not convey any very distinct idea: and Mr. Belsham, 'with a view to whom he even constituted the former dispensations.' Justin, it appears, did not understand the passage thus: and when he says ᾧ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἔκτισεν, ᾧ τὴν θάλασσαν, κ. τ. λ. he clearly meant that Christ was the *instrumental* and not the *final* cause. Irenæus had the same notion, who says of Christ, *per quem constituit omnia*: and Clement of Alexandria, ᾧ τὰ πάντα ἐεδημιούργηται; and Tertullian, 'tradidit omnia filio Creator quæ *per eum* condidit.' We may add, that in John i. 3. and Col. i. 16. both the Improved Version and Mr. Belsham translate the preposition διὰ *by* and not *for*. With respect to Heb. i. 2. Mr. Belsham follows Grotius, who says, that δι' οὗ is sometimes the same as ἐι' ὄν. It would be satisfactory to have some instances of it. He refers us to Thucyd. VI. 7. ἐι' οὐπερ πάντα ἐκινδύνευον, but the words are not there: also to 1 Cor. xiv. 19. where he translates διὰ τοὺς, 'with a view to be understood: ' but unless τοὺς

* Cohort. e. 22.

† Lib. i. 15, 5, p. 79.

‡ Theophil. ad Autolyicum, lib. ii. p. 88, annexed to the works of Just. Mart. Ed. Paris.

means in this place *the understanding of the person who hears the words*, which it evidently does not, this interpretation is absurd: it means the mind or understanding *of the speaker*. Schleusner, to whom Mr. Belsham refers, gives *propter* as one of the meanings of $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ with a genitive: but it is plain from his examples, that he meant to use *propter* as denoting the instrumental, not the final cause. Mr. Belsham's translation of $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$ will appear still more extraordinary, if we turn to another passage in this same Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 10. "Ἐπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, $\delta\iota' \omicron\nu$ τὰ πάντα καὶ $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$ τὰ πάντα — Here we have both constructions of the preposition $\delta\acute{\alpha}$, and we can hardly think that St. Paul considered them as identical: nor did Mr. Belsham think them so in this place, where he translates $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$ *by whom*, though in the former passage he contends that it ought to be rendered *for whose sake*. So also in Rom. xi. 36. where we read "Ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ $\delta\iota' \alphaὐτοῦ$ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, Mr. Belsham translates, *For of him and through him and to him are all things*. It appears, therefore, that wherever the expression is applied to God the Father, he considers $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ to mean *the instrumental cause*; but when it is applied to the Son, he understands it as denoting *the final cause*."—pp. 48, 50.

A similar instance of successful application of the writings of the Fathers to ascertain the text, and illustrate the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the Unitarian efforts to corrupt it, will be found in Mr. Burton's remarks on Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 16. § 2. The celebrated text, Romans ix. v. "*Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever,*" in the *Improved Version* is translated thus: "*And of whom by natural descent Christ came. God who is over all be blessed for ever.*" This mode of construction was entirely unknown to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and was never heard of till the time of Erasmus, who merely suggests it, as a way in which the sentence may be pointed, but does not say that it is right. The Unitarian translators, however, have the confidence to affirm in their note, "In this sense it is probable that the early Christian writers understood the words, who do not apply them to Christ." Lindsey and Belsham* say, that "this clause was read so as not to appear to belong to Christ, at least for the first three centuries;" and Jones† observes, "had the original stood as it now does, the early Fathers would have cited this clause in proof of the divinity of Christ. But neither Justin (I believe) nor Irenæus, nor Tertullian, has quoted it with this view."

Now these assertions are precise and positive; and every one of them are, as usual, direct and palpable falsehoods. Justin

* Lindsey, *Sequel to the Apology*, p. 204. Belsham adopts the words in his Translation of St. Paul's Epistles.

† Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans.

Martyr, indeed, *never quotes the passage at all*, so that it is impossible to say in what sense he understood it. Irenæus quotes it in the passage above referred to, as expressly asserting the divine and human natures of Christ. He is there arguing against the errors of the Gnostics, who made Christ and Jesus two distinct persons; the first divine, the second human; asserting that the man Jesus was merely the receptacle of the divine Æon, Christ; "*Dicunt Jesum quidem receptaculum Christi fuisse.*" The Gnostics, therefore, did not deny the godhead of Christ; on the contrary, they strenuously maintained it: but what they denied was the union of the divine and human natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. To confute this error, Irenæus quotes first, St. Matthew i. 18: "*Now the birth of Christ was in this wise;*" thus proving the humanity of Christ: and "lest we should think him merely human, the Holy Spirit," he adds, "calls him, by the mouth of the Evangelist, *Emmanuel*, God with us." He then proceeds to show, that this great truth of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of our Lord, is delivered by St. Paul, in the first verse of his Epistle to the Romans, and again in the fifth verse of the ninth chapter; where, speaking of Israel, he says, "*Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever;*" *ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in sæcula*;—words which will not admit of the Unitarian punctuation. As far, therefore, as Irenæus is concerned, the assertion of the Unitarians is a barefaced falsehood; and consequently it is false, that the early Christian writers did not so read this text as to apply it to Christ.

We come now to Tertullian, the next writer in point of time, of whom Mr. Jones pronounces, that he has never quoted the clause with this view. He has quoted it twice, with this express design, in his Treatise against Praxeas, where he is answering the objection of those who accused the Christians of worshipping more than one God. He shows, from the Old Testament, that the term God is applied to more persons than the Father;

"Not," says he, "that we ever name with our mouth two Gods or two Lords, although the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and each is God;—but I would follow the apostle, and if the Father and the Son are to be mentioned together, would call the Father God, and Jesus Christ Lord: yet speaking of Christ singly, I may call him God, as the same apostle did, *Of whom is Christ, who,*" he says, "*is God over all, blessed for ever.*"*

In the same treatise he again quotes this text, introducing it with these remarkable words: "Paul, also, himself, calls Christ

* Adv. Praxeam, c. 13. p. 507.

God: *Whose are the Fathers, and of whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever.*"* And here we may notice, by the way, another false assertion of the Unitarians, which the scope of Mr. Burton's work did not allow him to notice. "We do not find," says Mr. Lindsey,† "that the Holy Ghost was admitted into the Christian church, as a separate and distinct person of the Deity, until after some ages had passed over. Not in the year 325, &c." In the first of the passages here quoted from Tertullian, a Father of the second century, he expressly says, "the Father is God, and the Son is God, and *the Holy Ghost is God:*" and, if possible, he asserts the same still more explicitly in the conclusion of this treatise, where he calls the Holy Spirit "*tertium nomen divinitatis, tertium gradum majestatis;*" and adds, that the doctrine of the Trinity constitutes the sole distinction between the Jewish and the Christian faiths.

"For what other difference," he asks, "is there between us and them? or what need were there of the gospel, which is the substance of the New Testament, and limits the continuance of the law and the prophets until John, if we are not taught by it, that the Father and the Son, and the Spirit, whom we believe to be three, constitute one God?"‡

That Mr. Lindsey should not have *found* that the Holy Ghost was admitted as a distinct person of the Godhead, till after the Second Council of Constantinople, at the latter end of the fourth century, is not wonderful. Ignorant, as he was, of the writings of the Fathers, and apparently unable to read them, the wonder would have been if he had *found* it: but the greatest wonder of all is, that, conscious as he must have been, of his own ignorance, he should have dared to hazard such an assertion.

But we return to the consideration of the text, Rom. ix. 5. Mr. Burton, not satisfied with showing the falsehood of Mr. Jones's statement, that Irenæus and Tertullian do not quote the passage in proof of the divinity of Christ, exposes also the falsehood of Lindsey and Belsham, who extend the same remark to all the writers of the three first centuries. He shows that Hippolytus, who flourished about A.D. 220, and the Patripassian heretic Noetus, Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, Dionysius of Alexandria, and, last of all, the assembled Fathers of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 269, have all quoted this text, as a proof that the

* Adv. Praxeam, c. 15.

† Apology, p. 145.

‡ "Judaicæ fidei ista res, sic unum Deum credere, ut Filium adnumerare ei nolis, et, post Filium, Spiritum Sanctum. Quid enim erit inter nos et illos, nisi differentia ista? Quod opus Evangelii, quæ est substantia Novi Testamenti, statuens Legem et Prophetas usque ad Joannem, si non exinde Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus, tres crediti, unum Deum sistant?"—Adv. Praxeam, c. 30. p. 518.

Son of God is essentially and substantially God : and then he adds,

“ I would now ask, what grounds can Mr. Belsham or any other person have for saying, ‘that this text was read so as not to appear to belong to Christ at least for the first three centuries?’ If it is ever quoted by the Ante-Nicene Fathers so as to support this assertion, I am not aware of the passage : I have looked carefully for it through all their writings, and I wish the reader to decide, whether there is any trace, even the remotest suspicion, of any of these Fathers having understood the passage in any other way, except as plainly declaring that Christ is God.”—p. 83.

We may just add, that Mr. Belsham, in what he thinks proper to call his *Translation of St. Paul's Epistles*, quietly evades the force of this text, by altering $\delta \omega \nu$ into $\omega \nu \delta$, and translating it, “ whose is the God over all, blessed for ever;” and this he does (will the reader believe it?) when in his *Calm Inquiry*, which was published only five years before, he had used this unanswerable argument against admitting it: “ This conjecture, ingenious and even probable as it is, *not being supported by a single MS., version, or authority*, cannot be admitted into the text!”

In p. 87 are noticed another false assertion of Dr. Priestley's* that the Gnostics were the only persons who were considered as heretics for two or three centuries after Christ, and an attempt of his to prove that Irenæus did not regard the Ebionites as heretics, nor consider the Unitarian doctrines as heretical. Irenæus, however, expressly says, that “ those who believe Christ to be a mere man, begotten by Joseph, and do not acknowledge him as the Emmanuel, born of a virgin, have no share in the life eternal, which is his gift.”† It is certain, therefore, that Irenæus considered the Unitarian doctrine to be heretical. With respect also to the Ebionites, he expressly calls them heretics. “ Since the means,” says he, “ of detecting and convincing all *heretics* are various and multifarious, and we have proposed to ourselves to refute all according to their peculiar tenets, we thought it necessary to begin by noticing the source and root of them.” (Lib. i. c. 22.) In the following chapter he begins with Simon Magus, as the author of all *heresies*, “ ex quo universæ hæreses substituerunt;” and then notices, in order, “ Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, and the Ebionites,” c. 23—26. It cannot, therefore, be denied, that he directly includes the Ebionites in the number of heretics. With the same temerity of assertion, and the same disregard of truth, Dr. Priestley endeavours to persuade us, that Tertullian likewise did not consider the Unitarians to be heretics. It would be quite a sufficient

* Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. i. pp. 237, 274, &c. † Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 19. § 1.

answer to this falsehood to produce the passages above quoted from his Treatise against Praxeas, in which he affirms, that the chief and distinguishing article of the Christian faith, is the doctrine, that the three persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, constitute one God: this answer, we say, would be quite sufficient, even were it true, that Tertullian has nowhere expressly condemned the Unitarian heresy. But it so happens, that he has expressly condemned it, in his censure of the heretic Theodotus, of Byzantium, of whom he says, that “after being apprehended as a Christian, and denying his religion, he never ceased speaking blasphemies against Christ: for he introduced a doctrine, by which he called Christ a mere man, and denied him to be God.”*

We come now to the next Father in the order of time, Clement of Alexandria, who flourished A.D. 194. In p. 103. No. 70. Mr. Burton produces a passage from the first chapter of his *Cohortatio ad Gentes*, in which he quotes Phil. ii. 6: “*who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God;*” and instead of adding simply, as St. Paul does, “*but made himself of no reputation, or divested himself;*” (which would be a better translation of the original,) he says, “*but the compassionate God divested himself.*” Clement, therefore, considered, that St. Paul, in this text asserted the divinity of Christ. The Unitarians, on the contrary, contend that there is nothing in this passage which shows his divinity or pre-existence; and Dr. Priestley, in particular, asserts, “that Christ emptied himself of his former glory and power, and did not sustain the world during his abode on earth, is quite a modern opinion, and on that account only can never be received as the original and genuine doctrine of Christianity.†” On this passage Mr. Burton remarks, “It would be charitable to think that Dr. Priestley had never studied the early Fathers; but his own repeated assertions forbid us to justify his mistatements on these grounds.”—p. 116. And he shows, at great length, and by very copious extracts from their writings, that what Dr. Priestley has the confidence to censure as “quite a modern opinion,” was maintained by *every one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, who have alluded to this text of St. Paul. We would recommend Mr. Burton’s Dissertation on this passage of Scripture, with his illustrative interpretation of the phrase *ὄχ’ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο*, to the particular attention of our readers; and when they have compared the passages which he has collated from the works of the Fathers who have noticed this text, they will be prepared to answer his simple question, “whether they think the Fathers agreed with the Unitarians in saying,

* De Præscript. Hæret. c. xlvi. p. 221.

† Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. i. p. 59.

that this text admits of a fair interpretation consistent with the proper humanity of Jesus Christ?"*

Mr. Burton's quotations from the *Pædagogus* of Clement are very copious. Every page of this treatise shows, as he very truly remarks, that Clement intended Jesus Christ by the *Pædagogus*, or Instructor; and yet it is equally certain, that he attributes to this Instructor many sayings and actions, which in the Old Testament are ascribed to God. Thus, he says,† that the passage in Deut. xxxii. 10—12. is spoken of Jesus Christ, whom he calls "our Instructor, the holy God Jesus, the Word, who is the Leader of the human race,"—ὁ ἡμέτερος παιδαγωγὸς, ἅγιος θεὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ πάσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος καθηγεμῶν Λόγος—though it is expressly spoken of Jehovah. He afterwards refers to Gen. xxxii. 24—30, and other passages of Scripture, in which this Divine Instructor is said to have appeared to Jacob. The whole of Mr. Burton's quotation is too long for us to extract, but his ensuing remarks upon it are very strong, and exhibit another striking specimen of Socinian misrepresentation.

"There are two things which can hardly be denied, that Moses in Gen. xxxii. 24—30. is speaking of God, (Hosea says, that it was *the Lord God of Hosts*, xii. 5.) and that Clement refers the same transaction to Jesus Christ. He seems in fact to have had the identity of God and Christ so firmly impressed upon his mind, that he considered the two terms to be convertible, and that whatever was predicated of the one, belonged also to the other. We may observe farther, that Clement quotes the words in Exod. xx. 2. as spoken by Christ *in his own person*, which refutes the argument of the Unitarians, that Christ spoke in the person of God. Thus it has been stated to be "the unanimous opinion of all antiquity, that Christ appeared and spake in the person of God the Father." But this, as we see from Clement, is not true. If we believed it to be so, we must necessarily allow the pre-existence of Christ, though we might say that he was inferior to the Father; but it may be clearly proved, that the same words, which are ascribed in the Old Testament to God the Father, are quoted by many early writers as spoken by Christ in his own person."—p. 137.

And this he proves by the testimony of Tertullian and Irenæus.

In pp. 141—145. No. 84. we meet with a very interesting dissertation on the controverted text 1 Tim. iii. 16. "*Without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness: God was manifest in the flesh.*" In the Greek it is ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Of the meaning of these words there can be no doubt. Jesus, who was manifested in the flesh, is expressly called God. But it is disputed whether our received text presents the true reading; for, instead of Θεὸς

* Belsham's *Calm Inquiry*, p. 93.

† *Pædagog.* lib. i. c. 7. p. 131.

ἐφανερώθη, *God was manifested*, some MSS. read ὃς ἐφανερώθη, *he who was manifested*, and others, ὃ ἐφανερώθη, *that which was manifested*; both which readings make an intelligible sense, but entirely do away with that *great mystery*, which the words of St. Paul lead us to expect.

The question is one of mere testimony. Griesbach positively asserts, that though all the later MSS. read Θεός, *all the older have ὃς, or ὅ*; and, accordingly, he excludes Θεός from the text. Mr. Burton, however, informs us, that there is a MS. in the Bodleian library, of the eleventh century, of which Griesbach had no notice, which confirms the reading Θεός.* With respect to the evidence supplied by the writings of the Fathers for ascertaining the genuine reading, Griesbach observes, that Θεός “is not supported by any ancient document older than the end of the fourth century, and that all the Latin Fathers read *quod*.” In proving the latter point, Mr. Burton observes, that he quotes no Father who wrote prior to the Council of Nice, and that, as to the Greek Fathers, he says, “the oldest of them very seldom quote the passage;” and that the few who have spoken of “*God being manifest in the flesh*,” may have used the word *God*, because they thought that the passage applied to Christ; but that we cannot infer from hence, that they found Θεός in their copies! A more curious piece of reasoning than this we never met with, and can hardly imagine a more decisive proof of the strength of the Socinian prejudice of the writer. If the use by the earlier Fathers of that remarkable phrase, “*God manifest in the flesh*,” affords no proof or presumption that they read Θεός, in this disputed text, we should like to be informed how the fact can be made capable of proof: meanwhile the involuntary admission of Griesbach deserves especial notice, that these Fathers believed Christ to be God. Mr. Belsham, as usual, goes beyond his guides, and affirms in the most unqualified terms,† that Θεός is not cited by any early Greek writer, nor by any Latin writer whatever; and he quotes Dr. Clarke as saying, “that all the ancient Fathers, though the copies of many of them have now Θεός, yet from the tenor of their comments must always have read ὃς or ὅ.” The truth of this assertion Mr. Burton positively denies. In examining its accuracy, he notes down in order some of the places where the Ante-Nicene Fathers have spoken of God or Christ being *manifest in the flesh*; and though in some few instances we cannot perhaps decide whether they had this particular text in view, or no; yet as he justly remarks,

“Wherever the expression is coupled with the mention of a *mystery*,

* Canonici MS.

† *Calm Inquiry*, p. 144.

the probability is increased that they intended to quote the passage: and though the word *God* may not be mentioned, yet the authority will be of value, if the context shows, that Christ's coming in the flesh implies that he had also another and a higher nature."—p. 143.

In support of the received reading he then quotes Barnabas, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and lastly, Dionysius of Alexandria, who expressly says, that Christ was "invisible as God, and became visible: for *God was manifest in the flesh.*" Θεὸς γὰρ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. c. Paul Samos. p. 211.

Unitarian writers have asserted with great positiveness, that the ancient Fathers never applied the term *Almighty* to Christ. Gilbert Clerke, for instance, in his *Ante-Niceneism*,* asks, "where it can be found that any ancient doctor ever called Christ by the name of *God Almighty*?" The question is easily answered. Clement of Alexandria says, "he who hath the Almighty God, the Word, is in want of nothing:"† and in four other places which Mr. Burton has quoted, he expressly calls him *Almighty*, or the *Almighty God*. Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Cyprian are also proved by Mr. Burton to have applied to Christ this pre-eminent attribute of the alone Jehovah.

The last examples of Unitarian misrepresentation which we shall point out to our readers, are the false statements of the authors of the *Improved Version* respecting Marcion. These translators, it is well known, attempted to prove those parts of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which relate to the miraculous conception, to be spurious; and printed those passages in italics, as if they had confessedly been so. Now it is admitted by the Unitarians themselves, that these passages are found in *every MS. and every version* extant: and the only reason for questioning their genuineness, is, that the Ebionites rejected the commencement of St. Matthew's Gospel, and that Marcion, a heretic of the second century, rejected that of St. Luke.

"In the Introduction to the *Improved Version* it is asserted, that 'they are treated by Marcion with the most contemptuous ridicule:' see Tert. de Carn. Chr. sect. 2. But the writer of this passage had either not read Tertullian, or did not understand him. The *contemptuous ridicule* is Tertullian's, not Marcion's: Tertullian, in a strain of irony and sarcasm, represents Marcion's objections, and ends with saying, 'Such, I imagine, are the arguments by which you have dared to destroy the original documents of Christ.' The Unitarians seem to conclude, that Marcion rejected these passages from reasons of criticism: but this is an unfounded assumption, or rather the perversion of a fact. Marcion rejected them, not because he denied the miraculous conception, but

* See Bishop Bull's Answer to G. Clerke.

† Pædagog. lib. iii. c. 7. p. 27.

because he denied the proper humanity of Christ: he denied that Christ had been born at all, and contended that his body was a mere phantom; but he never pretended that his own Gospel was the genuine composition of St. Luke: he did not even call it by the name of that evangelist: he did not style it the genuine or improved version of St. Luke, but he was more honest and more consistent, he called it simply the Gospel.

“Again, the writer of the above passage says, that Marcion objected to ‘the prefatory chapters of Matthew and Luke:’ which is another misstatement. Marcion never noticed St. Matthew’s Gospel at all: he appears not to have admitted any of the Gospels, except that of St. Luke; and this, as we have seen, he mutilated and altered according to his own opinions. The only evidence, which we have against the authenticity of the beginning of St. Matthew’s Gospel, is contained in the fact mentioned above, that the Ebionites rejected it: and the Unitarians would persuade us that the authority of these heretics and of Marcion is to prevail against that of all the writers of the three first centuries. For it must be remembered that these very chapters are alluded to by Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c. &c. All these Fathers undoubtedly believed the beginning of the two Gospels to be genuine: they must therefore have believed the doctrine which these passages contain: and the Unitarians themselves will inform us what the doctrine is; it expressly declares the divinity of Christ: all these Fathers therefore must have believed the divinity of Christ, whether these chapters are genuine or no.”—pp. 174—176.

We have thus gone through not much more than a third part of Mr. Burton’s *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*; enough however has, we trust, been done to satisfy our readers of the intrinsic merits of the work, and to convince them of the gross ignorance, and still grosser misrepresentations and misstatements, of the Unitarian writers.

“In the course of the preceding pages, I have been led to point out, that several statements made by the Unitarians were unfounded. It had been asserted, that Jesus Christ was nowhere called *Creator*, *Δημιουργός*. I have shown at p. 51, that this epithet is applied to Christ by nearly all the Fathers. It has been asserted, that Christ is not spoken of as an object of religious worship. I have shown at p. 37, and 128, that all the Ante-Nicene Fathers considered it a duty to worship Christ. It had been said, that the word *Almighty* was never applied to Christ. I have proved at p. 145, &c. that in many places the Fathers called Christ Almighty. The reader will perhaps remember the incorrect statements which I quoted from Mr. Lindsey, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Belsham, concerning the words of St. Paul, Rom. ix. 5, (p. 77, &c.) and the false assertions which had been made concerning Acts xx. 28, (p. 15, &c.) In their interpretations of other texts, the Unitarians have equally forgotten that they are opposing themselves to all the writers of the three first centuries. Thus they say, that the creation of the world is not attributed to Christ in John i. 3, or Heb. i. 2: and yet I will venture to assert, that there is not one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers who quotes these passages,

without showing, beyond all doubt, that he understood these texts of *all things being created by Christ*. I repeat, that as to the opinion of the Fathers, and their unanimous consent upon this point, there is no room for contradiction or uncertainty: it only remains for the Unitarians to say, that all the Fathers were mistaken, that they were not such good judges of the style and language of the Apostles as we are, though Greek was the vernacular language of many of them, and some lived so near to the time of St. John, that it is hardly possible to suppose them so grossly ignorant of his meaning.

“To many persons it will appear a necessary consequence, that the Ante-Nicene Fathers believed Christ to be God, when they find him spoken of as the Creator of the world; as being conceived by the Virgin of the Holy Ghost; as having appeared to the patriarchs; as having taken our human flesh; as being worshipped, &c. &c. But I have also brought forward many instances, in which the Fathers expressly say, that Christ was God and man, that he was begotten of the *substance* of God, that he had existed from all eternity, that he was one with the Father. Will any rational person believe that the Fathers would have used these expressions, if they had held that Jesus Christ was a mere man.”—pp. 447, 448.

Unquestionably not: neither do we believe that any rational person will easily persuade himself that the Socinians are sincere, when they say, that the Apostles, and Primitive Christians, and Fathers of the Ancient Church, were, like themselves, strict Unitarians, and assertors of the mere humanity of Christ. Would any modern Unitarian, we ask, think it allowable to speak of Christ, as the Apostles, and earlier Fathers have unquestionably spoken of him? We answer, unhesitatingly, they would not. How then do they account for the fact, that the Apostles and ancient Christians have applied to our Lord the highest titles, powers, and attributes of the Godhead? They are prepared with a reply. All these magnificent expressions are easily to be accounted for, on the supposition that the Apostles and earlier Christian writers were seized, like certain Popish advocates of the Blessed Virgin, with an inordinate zeal and an extravagant desire to advance the honour of our Redeemer to the highest imaginable point; and that being excessively addicted, like all Jewish and Oriental writers, to the use of the most hyperbolical and figurative language, they thought proper to speak of Christ in terms which are strictly applicable to God alone, and to ascribe to him, mere mortal as he was, the incommunicable attributes of the self-existent and eternal Jehovah. This way of evading the difficulty is so palpably absurd and monstrous, that we must be permitted to doubt whether any human being was ever convinced by it. The Apostles, be it remembered, were Jews; the most rigid assertors of the Divine Unity, at least before their conversion to Christi-

anity; and, according to the Socinian hypothesis, they were the most strict maintainers of the mere humanity of our Lord, not only after they became his disciples, but to the last period of their ministry. The Unitarian, therefore, not only admits, but contends for it as true, that the Apostles and earlier Fathers of the Church entertained no higher notions of Jesus Christ, than those which the Jews have concerning Moses, or the Mohammedans concerning their prophet. If, then, the Unitarian supposition were true, we might expect to find, that other Jews have spoken of Moses in terms similar to those which the first Christians have employed in speaking of our Lord; and that the Mohammedan writers, who surely are not less addicted, than the Apostles are said to have been, to the figurative and hyperbolical style of Oriental composition, in their zeal to exalt Mohammed above the Author of the Christian faith, should have described him in terms not less magnificent than those which the first Christians have applied to Christ. Let them but produce the passages in which this is done, and we shall admit there is some shadow of truth belonging to their hypothesis. Let them show us, in the whole range of Jewish or Eastern writers, where the *Creation* of the Universe is attributed to Moses or Mohammed, as it is attributed to Christ by the Apostles, and nearly all the Fathers of the Church. Let them show us that Moses or Mohammed are spoken of as the objects of religious worship, in the same way as Christ is spoken of by *all* the Ante-Nicene Fathers. And, lastly, let them show us, where Moses or Mohammed are called "God over all, blessed for ever," as Christ is called by the Apostle St. Paul; or where the titles of the *Almighty*, and *Almighty God* are given to them, as they are given by many of the Fathers to Christ. When they have done this, we shall acknowledge that they have some ground for saying, that the earlier Christians were carried away by their excessive zeal for their Saviour's honour, and their familiar use of the extravagant figures and hyperboles of the East, to speak of him in terms which are proper only to the Deity. But till they have done this, we must be permitted to retain our opinion, that the Apostles and Fathers, who were firm upholders of the Divine Unity, (though not in the Socinian sense of the words,) would not have spoken of Christ as they have done, unless they had believed him to be truly God, of the same nature and substance with the Father; and that, on the contrary, had they believed him, as the Unitarians falsely assume, to be a mere man, they would have condemned those who had written of him, as they have now written, as guilty of blasphemy and idolatry.

It has been said that Socinianism is the half-way-house to

Infidelity. It is rather the receptacle of Deists, who profess a high regard for the moral character of Christ, and the moral precepts of the Gospel. That, in fact, the Unitarians make their last appeal, not to the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, but their own reason and opinion, has been abundantly proved; and if they would avowedly rest the truth of their religious tenets on this ground, we should give them more credit for sincerity and candour. But when they endeavour to persuade us, that their doctrine is the doctrine of Scripture, and of the best and purest ages of Christianity, their conduct is without excuse; for, in their gross perversions and misrepresentations of the sacred writings, and of the opinions of the Fathers, they are either influenced by a criminal intention to deceive, or, if they would escape from that heavy imputation, they must plead an ignorance which, when it assumes the mask of knowledge, is not much less culpable, and, as far as the interests of truth are concerned, is not a whit less mischievous.

But it is time that we should conclude this article, which some of our readers may, perhaps, already think too long. We cannot, however, take leave of our subject without again recommending this very elaborate and judicious work to the especial consideration of all those inquirers after truth, whose minds are wavering, and who wish to ground their own belief in that of the primitive and apostolic Church. Mr. Burton has here brought before us a cloud of witnesses, to prove that "the faith delivered by our Lord to his Apostles, and by the Apostles to their successors, was essentially that which our Church professes and cherishes:" and has fully redeemed the pledge, which his motto holds forth.

Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκ πατέρων εἰς πατέρας διαβεβήκεναι τὴν τοιαύτην ἐπίστασιν ἀποδεικνύομεν.—*Athanas. de Decret. Syn. Nicenæ*, § 27, vol. i. p. 233.

ART. II.—*Directions for the Study of Theology, in a Series of Letters from a Bishop to his Son, on his admission into Holy Orders.* By the Right Reverend George Gleig, L.L.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.S.A., and Honorary Associate of the Royal Society of Literature. Cadell. London. 1827.

FEW things can be of greater use to a young person engaged in any branch of learning than a judicious plan on which to pursue his studies. In the present day, particularly, when the number of books has increased to a magnitude hitherto unknown, the value of a learned and sensible guide, who has himself trodden the path of investigation and espied its various difficulties, be-

comes doubly enhanced. There is, we need not remark, in theology as well as in all other sciences, such a connexion and mutual dependence among its several parts as at once facilitates and renders necessary a systematic course of study: and the young man who enters upon it without the assistance which the experience of others can alone supply, not only loses much of his labour, but also exposes himself to the numerous disadvantages which arise from reading without fixed principles and a specific object. There is a certain order, too, in which books and systems should be examined, which cannot be reversed without incurring the hazard of many practical evils. It is no doubt true that the obvious distinction of theology into Natural and Revealed, as well as the division of the latter into the several branches of Doctrine, Evidences, Biblical Criticism, and Ecclesiastical Polity, must suggest a corresponding arrangement in the pursuits of the student; but it is manifest, notwithstanding, that a great deal of time and of painful research may be saved, by putting into his hand, before he begins his professional journey, a distinct map of the country through which it may be his intention to travel.

The volume before us, which professes to consist of instructions, conveyed in the form of letters, from a father to a son, lays claim to no ordinary consideration; not only because the subject is one of the most interesting on which human learning and talents can be employed, but more especially because the author is known to have devoted the greater part of a long life to theological inquiries, and inasmuch as we may be perfectly satisfied that, in directing the thoughts of an individual in whom he was so deeply concerned, he would spare no pains to discover and recommend the soundest principles of Christian Truth. The work appears to divide itself into three parts, and to treat, first, of Natural Religion; secondly, of the foundation of Morals, viewed in reference both to their object and their authority; and, lastly, of the Doctrines which are peculiar to Christianity.

In regard to the first of these sections, the bishop suggests the question, whether there be such a thing as *Natural Religion*: reminding us that some writers fiercely contend that there neither is, nor ever was, such a religion, while others insist with equal earnestness, not only that there is a religion which may with propriety be called *natural*, but that if there were not, we could have no satisfactory evidence for the truth of any religion professing to be a revelation from heaven. Bishop Gleig seems to have taken his place in the former class:

“For,” says he, “if by the phrase *Natural Religion* be meant a system of

religion *innate* in the mind of man, or discovered by human reason from the phenomena of nature, I am persuaded that there never was, nor ever could have been, such a religion professed or practised in this world. It has indeed been said that the belief of superior powers has been so universal in all ages and nations, savage as well as civilized, that it can be accounted for in no other way than by supposing such a belief natural to man, either as an *innate* or *instinctive*, or as a *conclusion* to which the phenomena of nature must necessarily lead the rudest savages. But has this belief been indeed universal? I suspect not. From all the accounts which we have had of the native Americans, when they were first visited by Europeans, it seems evident that there were amongst them large tribes who had no notion of a God or gods, and, of course, practised no religious rites or forms of worship. With respect to religion, the natives of New Holland appear to have been in the very same state; and we have the direct testimony of the intelligent Captain Parry and his associates, that the Esquimaux, with whom, in their second voyage, they past some dreary months in the polar regions, had not the smallest notion of any invisible powers to whom adoration is due. Even the notions of those savages, who seem to acknowledge a God or gods, cannot be *innate*, or proceed from what Lord Kames calls a *sense* of Deity; for innate or instinctive notions of religion, if there were any such, would, among savages, be necessarily uniform; and, as far as they extend, perfectly correct, as being impressions on the mind made by Him who created it. But so far is this from being the case, that even the rudest savages who practise any religious rites, appear to have very different conceptions of the beings, whom, by such rites, they intend to propitiate; and this they surely could not have, if their belief in the existence and attributes of such beings were derived immediately from the God of Truth—the equal Lord of savage and of sage. Instinctive belief in powers invisible is, like innate ideas, a phrase which I do not understand.”

On this point, namely, whether the being of a God be discoverable from the phenomena of nature, we differ with the bishop. As to the question, indeed, more immediately before us, which is, we presume, whether a religious system has at any time been actually established on the deductions of unassisted reason, it is extremely difficult to come to a satisfactory determination, because it is impossible to ascertain whether any tribe of human beings has ever existed to whom some notices, however obscure, of the primitive religion have not been transmitted. Perhaps there is no class of men, even among the most ignorant of barbarians, who have not been able to say in reference to their belief and pious usages, “Our fathers have told us.” It may, therefore, be regarded as a matter of merely speculative curiosity, to inquire whether the human mind be capable of ascending from the contemplation of the “things that are made,” to the knowledge of Him who made them, and of founding upon that knowledge such

a system of adoration and ritual observance as might be entitled to the name of religious worship. Bishop Gleig is persuaded, that there never was, *nor ever could have been*, such a religion professed or practised in this world;—a conclusion in which we cannot coincide, for the following reasons.

In the first place, it appears to us next to impossible that a human being, possessed of the ordinary faculties of perception and intellect, should reach the term of manhood, without having impressed upon his mind the important conviction that himself, and the material universe around him, must have proceeded from the operation of a Cause, whose power and wisdom were inconceivably great. It may be true, as the learned author observes, that the relation of cause and effect, philosophically considered, is of a nature so extremely subtle and recondite, that not one man out of a hundred, in the most enlightened nations of modern Europe, has such a conception of it as would enable him to trace a series of events to their primary cause: but it is not less certain that the most ignorant of mankind are, by an original law of their mental constitution, led to infer that, wherever there is an effect, there must have been a cause adequate to its production. The irresistible belief, that an effect implies a cause, is a very different thing from a philosophical inquiry into the relation which the former of these bears to the latter, or rather, perhaps, into the history of the conceptions which a thinking man forms in regard to the connexion which subsists between the antecedent and the consequent in any given succession of physical events. The veriest savage must, we think, necessarily conclude, when the thunder rolls over his head, that there is a Great Being who gives wings to the lightning, and points out the objects on which its fury is to be expended; and the awe, the reverence, and the terror, with which he is struck on such an occasion, cannot but be different from the feelings which make domestic animals run to the house, and wild fowls cower on the ground.

But, in the second place, the question as it respects the basis of Natural Religion, ought not to be confined to the most rude and destitute condition of the human race. Those who maintain that the existence of a God is discoverable from the phenomena of nature have a right to argue upon the most improved state in which men have been found to exist, independently of revelation, and of the opinions which they are known to have held in relation to the origin and maintenance of the physical world.

Do we not find, then, that many nations of antiquity arrived at the belief of a Great First Cause, to whom adoration was due, and whose benignity or resentment might be approached with offering and sacrifice, with adulation and entreaty? It will be

said, in reply, that such notions of the Deity were traditional, and could not have been *excogitated* from contemplating the facts and laws of the visible creation. But it is worthy of notice, that the religious dogmas of the heathen philosophers bore so slight a resemblance to the primæval revelation vouchsafed to the ancestors of the great human family, that it is more reasonable to view them as the natural conclusions of unaided reflection, than the corrupted remains of a purer faith. The mythology of Egypt, of Greece, and of Rome, was, in truth, a religious personification of the physical powers or properties of the material world. The prolific energy under various names and relations constituted the principal object of worship; and the most interesting rites of the national creed exhibited an immediate reference to the periodical decay or renovation, the departure or the return of those genial influences, upon which the propagation of organized forms has its main dependance.

Such a religion, we think, may be called *natural* in its strictest sense; and upon its principles were founded the popular superstitions of nearly all the nations of the ancient world. We find, moreover, that the more learned and contemplative among the pagans, whether in the East or in the West, were in due time led, by reflecting upon the harmony which prevails in the mundane system, to ascribe its plan and operations to the volition of one Great Mind; and hence arose those more refined doctrines of theism which adorn the works of Plato, Cicero, and Seneca.

Are we not authorized, in the third place, to maintain that St. Paul admitted the existence of such a system of natural religion, prior to the introduction of Christianity, as implied belief in the existence of God, and, consequently, the means of forming a natural worship, and of enforcing the obligations of the moral law? In his Epistle to the Romans, in the beginning of which he presents a melancholy view of the depraved condition of the heathen world, he condemns the Gentile sinners, not because they had failed to discover in the great volume of nature the evidence which is there unfolded for the being and attributes of the Eternal Creator, but because, that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful. He assures us that the wrath of heaven was revealed against all unrighteousness, whether in the Jews or in the Gentiles; because, in reference to the latter, he remarks, "that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse."

Is it not manifest that the Apostle vindicates the justice of

God in punishing the pagans for their sins, on the very ground that they might, from the phenomena of nature, have discovered the existence of a Supreme Being, and even the laws of his moral government? Could he have said that *they are without excuse*, if they had not, from natural knowledge, possessed the means of satisfying themselves as to the foundation of all religion, the being of a God? Nay, in his address to the people of Lystra, he chid their ignorance and upbraided their superstition, by reminding them only of that simple proof which they had for the providence of the All-wise Creator of heaven and earth, in the beneficial effects which result from the revolutions of the year. "He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."—Acts, xiv. 17.

We are, therefore, disposed to believe that there would arise among human beings, who had no other revelation granted to them than that to which the Psalmist alludes in his sublime hymn on the creation, a set of opinions and pious usages, which might properly be called natural religion; for assuredly, while the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy-work, there is neither speech nor language, but their voices are heard among them; their sound goes out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world. But the bishop concludes very differently; saying, it can hardly be supposed that the first race of men, if they were such beings as the present, and left entirely to themselves, could ever have discovered, from the phenomena of nature, the Great First Cause of all things. It must, therefore, he thinks, be granted, that there never was, nor ever could have been, a system wholly *discovered* by the light of nature.

"But though all this must be granted, I am still decidedly of opinion that there is a sense in which we may with great propriety talk of *natural religion* as distinguished from that which is wholly of supernatural *revelation*; because there are many religious truths which, though they could not have been originally *discovered* by uninspired men, are yet capable of being proved, with the force of demonstration, from the phenomena of nature. If, indeed, this were not the case, I cannot conceive upon what evidence Christianity, or any other religion professing to be a revelation from God, could be received by us as indisputably true. There are, however, many pious, and learned, and well-informed men who labour to prove that we have no other evidence for even the being and attributes of God than what we derive from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; but when they are asked why we give implicit credit to the narratives contained in these Scriptures, the answer which they return is such as if it were given to a question on any other subject, put by themselves, would excite, and justly excite, their contempt. Ac-

ording to their reasoning, the only evidence that we have for the existence and attributes of God, is the infallible testimony of the Scripture; and we believe that the testimony of Scripture is infallible, only because it is the word of God!"

The doctrine of Bishop Gleig, therefore, on this head may be given in a few words: the *proof* of the existence and attributes of God must be drawn from the phenomena of nature—the work of the Divine hands; but the knowledge of the *fact itself*, that there is a God who made and who governs the world, must have been derived from revelation, inasmuch as it could not have been inferred from any manifestations of power, wisdom, or of goodness, which appear in the arrangements of creation and of providence. Hence it follows that there is no real distinction between natural and revealed religion; the former being only the means by which the latter is most successfully illustrated and confirmed. Nay, on the ground now assumed, it must be acknowledged that, in the usual acceptation of the phrase, there is no natural religion at all; for as, without belief in the Deity, there can be neither faith nor works, men must for ever have sought in vain amid the things which are seen, for the existence and character of Him who is invisible. The bishop explains his views more at length in the following paragraph, in which, however, he seems to admit that the existence of God may be inferred from the study of his works, even without the aid of revealed religion.

“That the first principles of religion were communicated to the progenitors of the human race by inspiration, is, and, I think, *must* be readily granted by every unprejudiced and reflecting theist; but it is equally evident that these principles must be capable of being taught by *natural* means to the descendants of those to whom they were miraculously communicated, otherwise there could be now no such thing as true religion on the face of the earth. No man has for many centuries past been miraculously inspired with the knowledge of religion or of any thing else: and before we can rationally believe that any man was ever miraculously inspired, we must be convinced that a Being exists capable of working miracles, and such a Being as will not deceive us. On this great question it is absurd to appeal to the authority of the Scriptures. Those Scriptures, indeed, profess to contain a series of revelations vouchsafed to mankind, at different times, by the Creator and Governor of the world; but before we, to whom individually no such revelations have been made, can give implicit credit to these professions, we must be convinced *by other means*, not only that there is a Creator and Governor of the world, but also that he is such a Being as, in a matter of such infinite importance, will neither deceive his rational creatures, nor suffer them to be deceived, if they make the proper use of the intellectual powers with which he hath endowed them.”

We observe, that in this very important field of research, the

Scottish prelate recommends to the study of his son the works of Bacon, Locke, Hartley, Law, Berkeley, and Stewart; and we cannot refrain from adding, that we should wish to see every candidate for Holy Orders accurately and critically acquainted with the speculations of these able authors. It has often been a loss, and sometimes a reproach, to the clergy of our Church, that, after acquiring with great pains, and no small cost, a competent knowledge of theological learning, they have been found deficient in many parts of that more humble and more accessible science, which leads the mind to a comprehension of its own powers and operations, and lays open the sources of those feelings and combinations of thought which constitute the basis of human action, and supply the colours which diversify the character of that numerous class of society whom it is their especial duty to admonish and direct.

The chapters which follow, on "Some Celebrated Systems of Natural Theology," and on the "Duties of Natural Religion and the Different Theories of Moral Obligation," contain much learned disquisition on the most interesting topics that can employ the attention of a young divine. The strictures, particularly on the theories of Dr. Clarke and Mr. Wollaston, are not less profound than accurate, and manifest, on the part of the author, extensive reading joined to an uncommon degree of metaphysical acumen. But to these portions of the work, as they are incapable of abridgement, we must rest satisfied with this general reference.

The letter on the "State of Man before and after the Fall," affords matter for deep study and much careful investigation. The bishop has given a very distinct outline of the opinions of Pelagius, of Calvin, and of Arminius, on the effects, whether penal or moral, which have been produced by the disobedience of our first parents. The first of these writers, according to Collier, the ecclesiastical historian, maintained, 1st, that Adam had mortality in his nature, that whether he had sinned or not sinned, he would certainly have died: 2d, that the consequences of Adam's sins were confined to his own person, and that the rest of mankind received no disadvantage from them: 3d, that the *Law* qualified for the kingdom of heaven, and was founded upon equal promises with the *Gospel*: 4th, that before the coming of our Saviour some men lived without sin: 5th, that new-born infants are in the same condition with Adam before his fall: 6th, that the death and disobedience of Adam is not the necessary cause of death to all mankind, neither doth the general resurrection of the dead follow in virtue of our Saviour's resurrection: 7th, that if a man will make the most of himself, he may keep the commands of God without difficulty, and preserve himself in a perfect state

of innocence: 8th, that to rich men, notwithstanding the advantage of their baptism, unless they parted with all their estate, all other instances of virtue would be insignificant, neither could they be qualified for the kingdom of heaven: 9th, that the grace and assistance of God are not granted for the performance of every moral act; the liberty of the will, and information in points of duty, being sufficient for this purpose: 10th, that the grace of God is given in proportion to our merits: 11th, that none can be called the sons of God unless they are perfectly without sin: 12th, that our victory over temptation is not gained by God's assistance, but by the liberty of the will.—*Eccles. Hist. Book I. Cent. V.*

Of these propositions, it is justly observed, that many are indisputably false, and some even extravagantly absurd; but, in justice to our countryman, we should keep in mind, that they have been conveyed to us by his theological antagonists, and that the language, even the philosophical language, of antiquity was, on such subjects, much less precise than the language of good writers in the present age.

In opposition to the Pelagian heresy, the Calvinist has unquestionably been carried into the other extreme. He teaches that the penal effects of the first transgression are conveyed from the parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so that all who have proceeded from Adam and Eve, are conceived and born in sin; are under the displeasure and curse of God; bond-slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments—not in this world only, but also in that which is to come; and that the punishments to which, for the Original Sin, they are liable in the world to come, are everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body in hell-fire for ever.

“The English Arminians, though they deny all hereditary *guilt* in the proper sense of the words, have very different notions of the effects produced on human nature by the fall of our first parents. Some of them believe that, the soul being naturally immortal, the extinction of consciousness was not implied in that death which Adam by his fall had brought upon himself and all his posterity; but that a *moral taint*, or propensity to evil, has been conveyed from him to the souls of all his descendants, by ordinary generation. Others, considering this notion as tending to materialism, and indeed as inconceivable on any other principle, contend that there is no occasion to suppose that a moral taint was, or could be, communicated from Adam to the souls of his children; for since we know by experience that certain diseases of the body affect all the powers of the mind to which it is united, it is surely more probable that the temperament of the bodies of all men, when they became mortal and liable to diseases of various kinds, became at the same time such as to debase the powers of the mind united to them, than that God, in

punishment of Adam's sin, should have determined to infuse into the bodies of all his descendants, minds tainted with moral depravity. A third party of those who amongst us are called Arminians, or Pelagians, or sometimes by a name of much worse import, observe that they find in Scripture, no evidence whatever of the powers of the human mind being depraved by the fall of Adam and Eve; that Adam fell under a temptation, which many of his sons, supposed to be degenerated, have resisted and overcome; that, on his fall, he was indeed deprived of that divine instruction, both oral and internal, which he constantly enjoyed in paradise; and that the loss of this, with the extinction of consciousness at the separation of the soul from the body, was all that was implied in the *death* denounced against eating the forbidden fruit. At the head of this party may be placed the illustrious Bishop Bull, Archbishop King, Bishop Taylor, Bishop Warburton, and Bishop Law; but it must be confessed that all these prelates, with the exception of the two last mentioned, have expressed in different parts of their works, sentiments on this subject very inconsistent with each other."

The doctrines alluded to in the close of the last paragraph, have, with some slight modifications, been adopted by Bishop Gleig, from the writings of Bull and Warburton. Viewing the penalties inflicted upon the human race, for the violation of the first command in the Garden of Eden, as being confined to the utter and everlasting extinction of consciousness in the hour of death, these learned divines maintain that the main object of our blessed Lord's death was to restore to mankind the life and immortality which were forfeited by our first parents, together with the means of grace which are necessary to enable even the best of men to become meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light.

"The great purpose," says our author, "for which a Redeemer was first promised, is admitted by all who deserve to be called Christians, to have been to restore to the whole race of mankind the life which was lost by the Fall; for we are assured, that since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; and that, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "Divines," he adds, "are not agreed about the nature and extent of that death which all have incurred by the fall of Adam; but whatever it be, it is expressed in the denunciation against eating the forbidden fruit, by the very same word that the Apostle makes use of when he says, 'As in Adam all die—*πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσι*—even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' From the death, therefore, which is derived from Adam's fall, shall all who have undergone, or may undergo it, be undoubtedly restored by that Redeemer who declared himself to be the 'resurrection and the life,' and of whom it is said by the Apostle, that 'he took upon him flesh and blood that by death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.'" "That this redemption," he continues,

“ the only redemption which, in strictness of speech, was promised to our first parents, will be universal, is therefore the express doctrine of St. Paul, as it was likewise of his Divine Master. ‘ As the Father,’ said our Lord to the Jews, ‘ hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the *son of man*’—the son promised to our first parents as the seed of the woman who was to bruise the head of their deceiver. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in which *all* that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. As Christ died to redeem mankind from the death incurred by the fall of their first father, this redemption, of course, comprehends all men, as well Heathens, Jews and Mahometans, as Christians, so has it likewise been wholly of *grace* and without *conditions*; for though death is the *wages* of sin, *eternal life* is not the *wages* of righteousness; but the *gift* of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Redemption, therefore, in its original sense, as promised to the fallen parents of the human race, has been, or rather will be at the general resurrection, universal and unconditional. The stupendous plan, into which even the angels desired to look, was formed by the divine wisdom and goodness, and carried into complete effect, without any co-operation of ours; but not as the offence so also is the *free gift*. For if, through the offence of one, the many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by the grace, which is by the one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto the many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment, or sentence, was of one offence unto condemnation, but the free gift—*χαρισμα*—is of many offences unto justification. For if by the offence of the one man, death reigned by the one; much more they who receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of the righteousness, or remission, shall reign in life by the one Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by one offence, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by one righteousness, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.

“ Through the whole of this passage our loss by the fall of our first father is contrasted with our gain by the cross of Christ; and as we were subjected to the consequences of Adam’s sin—not willingly or by ourselves, so we have contributed nothing to that *justification of life*, which hath come upon *all men* by the *free gift*; for as Christ was freely delivered by the compassionate goodness of God for our offences, so was he raised again for our justification. Hence it is, that, in the estimation of the Apostle, our gain in Christ is greater than our loss in Adam; and this is indisputably the case. The *free gift*, as immortality is here and indeed everywhere called with great propriety, is now conferred upon all men, in such a manner as renders it impossible to be again forfeited. It is not held under the Christian dispensation, as it was under the paradisaical, on the precarious tenure of any mere man’s obedience to any law, whether moral or positive, but is the ‘ gift of God’ once for all bestowed on the human race through Jesus Christ our Lord; who, having made atonement by his blood, or, as the Apostle expresses it,

having 'died unto sin once,' is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. It is therefore indisputable, if the Scriptures of the New Testament be indeed the word of God, that the Word, or Divine Logos, was made flesh, or took upon him our nature, that, by dying in that nature as the Lamb of God, he might take away the *sin* (την ἁμαρτιαν) not *sins*, but that *sin* of which the consequences have fallen on the whole world."

It is objected to the opinions of those who restrict the benefits of redemption to the mere restoration of immortality, supposed to have been forfeited by the disobedience of our first progenitors, that the Articles of our Church assert that Christ's death was a sacrifice, "not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." And it is alleged, in reply, that many divines of the highest eminence, and as far removed from the heresies of Socinus and the modern Unitarians as was Calvin himself, or Luther, or Melancthon, have taught that the sins, for which the death of Christ was, in strictness of speech, an *expiation*, was only the sin of our first parents, by which immortality was forfeited to the whole human race. According to this view, the sacrifice made on Calvary must be considered as having atoned for the actual sins of men, merely by its having taken away the consequences of the original guilt, and thus opened a way for the divine benevolence being extended to penitent sinners in that life which will never have an end.—But, observes Bishop Gleig,

"Warburton, I think, must have viewed our redemption by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross through some such medium as this: for though he never fails to express, in his usual strong language, his abhorrence of Socinianism, wherever he has occasion to mention it, yet it seems evident from the ninth book of his Divine Legation, and from one or two of his sermons, that he considered our redemption from the death incurred by the fall of our first parents as the sole purpose for which a Redeemer was expressly promised to the apostate pair, and for which, in the fullness of time, he died on a cross. This I confess was for many years my own opinion; but now I think differently, and am convinced that Christ gave his life a sacrifice, as *directly* for the actual sins of men as for the original guilt of our first parents. To the eternal and omnipresent God, all these sins must have been for ever known; and unless they were all in the divine contemplation when the stupendous plan of human redemption was formed, it is not easy, I think, to comprehend the full force of St. Paul's argument, when, to prove that we have in Christ gained more than we lost in Adam, he says, 'Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift, for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification of life.'"

There is a very able letter on the "Doctrine of Justification," where, in the course of his discussion, the bishop removes many

difficulties which are apt to beset the progress of the youthful student, as well as of the unlearned reader of St. Paul's epistles; and where, at the same time, he vindicates the language and reasoning of the inspired penmen from the foolish charges which have been occasionally urged against them. He adopts the distinction of a *first* and *final* justification; the former applying to that state of favour and acceptance with God, which marked the introduction of converted Pagans into the Christian church, while the latter is restricted to the acquittal of the faithful at the tribunal of Christ, when the whole human race shall be arraigned before him. The notion of a *first* and *second* justification seems to have been disliked by Bishop Bull; and it is perhaps to be wished that our translators had rendered the Greek words differently, when they relate to the admission of converts into the mystical body of the Redeemer, and when they mean the acquittal of those who, at the general judgment, shall be set on the right hand of the Sovereign Judge. The distinction however, as Bishop Gleig remarks, has been admitted, and appears to have been perfectly understood by the compilers of our Articles; for if they had admitted of no other justification than that which shall be finally pronounced at the general judgment, they could not have said, as they do in the twelfth Article, that "good works pleasing to God are the fruits of faith and *follow after justification*"; for after our *final* justification our good works cannot possibly be the fruits of *faith*, which will then be swallowed up in vision. If, then, there be, as our Church and the Scriptures teach, a double justification, of which the first is when we are admitted into the church or kingdom of God, and the other, when, at the end of the world, we shall hear that most joyful sentence of our Judge, "Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," there can, he concludes, be no difficulty in putting an end to all controversies about *justification* among those who are really desirous to discover the truth as it is in Jesus.

The essay on "Regeneration" is not less able and satisfactory than the one which we have just abridged. The bishop, as might be expected, defends with great ability the primitive truth and order which are inculcated by our truly apostolical Church; maintaining that we are *regenerated* at the time when we are grafted into the body of Christ's church. Alluding to the dogma of our evangelical brethren, that there is a certain point or period in the life of every man who shall be admitted into the kingdom of God, at which he hath or shall be made *sensible* of his *regeneration*, and that this effect is produced by the instrumentality of *faith* and by the *preaching of the Word*,

"I should be happy," says he, "to be informed, how, according to their doctrine, infants can be saved, or for what purpose infants are baptized. Infants cannot be regenerated or born anew by their *faith*, or by the *preaching of the word*; nor, supposing them capable of regeneration or new birth, can they be made *sensible* of it. If the outward form in baptism be only a sign or seal of the inward part or thing signified, and if that thing be *faith*, excited by *hearing or reading the word of God*, to infants, it is the sign or seal of nothing: and all who hold this opinion ought, unquestionably, to join the communion of the Anti-pædobaptists. Of the salvation of infants, whether baptized or not, some of them speak and write very doubtfully, and no wonder; while others, not very consistently, do indeed admit that even to infants the period of baptism may *occasionally* be the time of mercy; but the majority of that class of theorists confidently affirm that at baptism infants receive only the *sign of profession*, and that those only are spiritually regenerated *whom God hath chosen out of mankind according to his eternal purpose and grace, given unto them in Jesus Christ before the world began.*"

We have found it necessary to pass over several very able articles, such as those on the "Religion of Mankind, from Adam to Abraham;" on the "State of Religion, from Abraham to Moses;" on the "Mosaic Dispensation, preparatory to the Advent of the Messiah;" on the "Advent of Christ;" on the "Doctrine of the Trinity;" on the "Death of Christ, an Atonement for the Sins of Men;" on "Predestination and Sanctification;" on the "18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st Articles of Religion;" and on the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The last essay, in particular, deserves the attentive study of every theological tyro, inasmuch as it contains an outline of the different opinions which have been entertained on this important subject, by the most distinguished divines in the several Christian communions, and recommends, with great force of reasoning, the views which are held respecting it by our own Church.

There is in the Appendix to this volume an ingenious dissertation on the "Miracles of our Saviour and his Apostles," in which the bishop examines some recent hypotheses on this head, and especially the arguments of the late Mr. Playfair, of Edinburgh, in his well-known review of the works of Laplace. Admitting for a moment the accuracy of Hume's maxim, that "no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish," Bishop Gleig proceeds to illustrate the striking position that,

"if it can be shown that the testimony given by the Apostles and other first preachers of the Gospel to the miracles of their Lord, would, on the supposition that those miracles were not really performed, have been as great a deviation from the known laws of nature as the miracles them-

selves, the balance must be considered as openly poised by opposite miracles : and whilst it shall continue so, the judgment must remain in a state of suspense. But, if it shall appear that, in this case, the false testimony would have been a deviation from the laws of nature much less probable in itself than the miracles recorded in the Gospels, the balance will be instantly destroyed ; and by Mr. Hume's maxim, we must reject the supposition of falsehood in the testimony of the Apostles, and admit the miracles of Christ to have been really performed."

The reasoning pursued in this instance by the learned author is founded, in the first place, upon the law of association, which so connects the ideas of men with the words usually employed to express them, that, without an effort to dissolve this natural connexion, every one is led immediately and unconsciously to speak the truth. The ideas of the things which any individual has seen or heard are generated in his mind by external objects, according to the established *laws of nature* ; and till they be effaced from his memory, they must always, by the law of association, which is one of those laws, make their appearance there with all their mutual relations, and in their appropriate dress. In the very act of learning to *speak*, we necessarily learn to speak the *truth* ; for *mental truth*, or the connexion between ideas and the things which they represent, is impressed upon our minds by Him who cannot err ; and were we not to employ words for the expression of that truth exactly as they are employed by those with whom we converse, our language would be unintelligible jargon ; and we could neither declare our wants, nor ask relief, with any hope of success. In every case, therefore, where the fact recorded is in itself possible, and attributed to a cause which we know to be adequate ; where a competent number of witnesses had sufficient means of information, and were under no inducement to deceive, testimony is complete evidence, however extravagant the fact may be, because no fact which is known to have an adequate cause, can be so incredible as that a number of men of sound understanding shall act in a manner inconsistent with the fundamental principles of human nature, or be able, if so disposed, to dissolve every association which had been formed in the mind of each of them from his infancy, and form new ones, all agreeing exactly with one another, and yet all contrary to the truth.

" If this reasoning be just, and if the testimony of the Apostles to their own and their Master's miracles be false, it follows undeniably, either that they concerted a consistent scheme of falsehood, and agreed to publish it at every hazard ; or that God had dissolved all the associations, which had been formed in their minds, of ideas of sense with the words of language, and arbitrarily formed new associations, all in exact conformity with each other, but all in direct contradiction to truth. One

or other of these events *must* have taken place; because, upon the supposition of falsehood, there is no alternative. But such a dissolution and formation of associations of ideas with words as is supposed in the latter event, is as great a deviation from the established laws of nature, or, in other words, as real a miracle as the resurrection of a man from the dead; and all real miracles being acknowledged to be equally great, either of these could have been performed only by a power equal to the performance of the other."

This species of argument, being grounded on a refined view of the metaphysical qualities of the human intellect, may not, it is probable, appear equally cogent to every description of readers; but there is no one who will not perceive the strength of the bishop's reasoning, when he proceeds to prove that the supposed voluntary agreement of the Apostles, in such a scheme of falsehood as they are said to have published to the world, would be an event not less miraculous than the divine interposition for the unworthy purpose mentioned in the former hypothesis.

"When they sat down," says he, "to fabricate this pretended revelation, and to contrive a series of miracles to which they were all to appeal for its truth, it is plain, since they proved successful in this daring enterprise, that they must have clearly foreseen every possible circumstance in which they could be placed, and prepared consistent answers to every question that could be put to them by their most inveterate and most enlightened enemies; by the statesman, the lawyer, the philosopher, and the priest. That such foreknowledge as this would have been miraculous will not surely be denied; since it forms the very attribute which we find it most difficult to allow even to God himself." "Thus then," he concludes, "do miracles force themselves on our assent in every possible view which we can take of this interesting subject. If the testimony of the first preachers of the Gospel was true, the miracles recorded in the New Testament were certainly performed, and the doctrines of our religion were derived from heaven. On the other hand, if that testimony was false, either God must have miraculously effaced from the minds of those by whom it was given, all the associations formed between their ideas of sensation and the words of language, or he must have endowed those men with the gift of prescience, and at the same time have compelled them to fabricate a pretended revelation for the purpose of deceiving the world, and involving themselves and their immediate followers in certain and foreseen destruction. Hence it follows that the supposition of the Apostles bearing *false* testimony to the miracles of their Master, implies a series of deviations from the laws of nature, infinitely less probable in themselves than those miracles: and therefore by the maxim of Hume and his disciples, we must reject the supposition of falsehood in the testimony, and admit the reality of the miracles."

We recommend to the attention of our more learned readers the second tract in the Appendix, entitled, on the "Origin of the three first Gospels." Every divine is aware of the difference of

opinion which prevails among critics and commentators in regard to the immediate source whence the Evangelists derived their materials, as well as in relation to the principles on which they constructed their respective narratives of our Saviour's life and ministry. Dr. Townson and his followers maintain, that the second in order availed himself of the labours of the first, and that the third wrote, with the gospels of the two former spread out on his table; correcting and altering their statements according to his individual recollection, or the better opportunities of information which he might happen to enjoy. Bishop Marsh, on the other hand, supposes that the several memoirs of our Blessed Lord were transcribed by their authors from a common record or document to which they all had access. But Bishop Gleig adheres to the more usual and best-established notion, that the Evangelists wrote from that supernatural *remembrance* which their Divine Master promised to assist, and which was to be made the depository of all the truth necessary to the confirmation of the Christian faith.

“Were I,” says he, “under the necessity of adopting either Dr. Marsh's or Dr. Townson's hypothesis, I think I should prefer the former to the latter, because it does not represent the Evangelists, as the other unquestionably doth, as *tacitly censuring* each other for inaccuracy. With respect to evidence, the two hypotheses are on the very same footing; for the ingenious authors, in support of them urge nothing but the *supposed necessity* of that which each has adopted, to account for coincidences of language and of facts among the different Evangelists—coincidences which all parties seem to think require some solution. He admits of a common document; but that document was no other than the preaching of our Blessed Lord himself. He was the great prototype. In looking up to him, the Author of their faith and mission, and to the very words in which he was wont to dictate to them, they have given us three gospels, often agreeing in words, and always in sense.”

The last essay in the volume, and perhaps the cleverest of the whole, is on the “*Doctrine of Original Sin.*” We regret however, to say, that the venerable author, by using language not familiar to divines and apparently inconsistent with the terms of our ninth Article, has exposed himself to the charge of heresy. The expression, *original sin*, is nowhere indeed to be found in Scripture, being a mere technical phrase, introduced for the convenience of theological writers; and we are ready to admit that the influence of the Calvinistic hypothesis has imperceptibly given an intensity of meaning to the words employed by the compilers of our Articles, which they had not in the days of Cramer. That human nature is corrupted, Bishop Gleig does not in any part of his volume deny; but instead of holding with the majority of divines, that the depravity, of which there are on all hands so many un-

deniable proofs, was the immediate effect of the first disobedience and inflicted upon the children of Adam as a part of the punishment due to his sin, he appears to teach that our corruption has been gradual; springing in a great measure from the evil communication which corrupts good manners. *Guilt*, it is true, as it necessarily implies the consciousness of having violated a law, or disobeyed a command, cannot be transferred from one person to another; but as the *effects* of guilt may be rendered hereditary, passing from one generation to another; and as by a very common figure of speech, the effect in all languages is taken for the cause, the expression, original *sin*, cannot be understood by any man of ordinary discernment to denote any thing more than that *fault* or corruption of our nature which has proceeded from the introduction of moral evil by the first parents of the human race. This defect, or deprivation of man's nature is such, that, both in reference to its source and its practical consequences, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation; a position which Bishop Gleig does not controvert in reality, though, by the terms which he has adopted in the illustration of his particular views, he affords, even to a candid reader, grounds for calling in question the orthodoxy of his creed.

Possessed of this guard, the young divine may proceed with the utmost safety to analyse the reasoning of the northern prelate, which he will find supported with equal talent and erudition. His examination of the texts usually adduced by the high Calvinist to strengthen his peculiar interpretations of Scripture, is masterly in a great degree. The essay, throughout, indeed, bears the strongest marks of long and deep thought, as well as an intimate acquaintance with the works of the Fathers, and the learning of the English Church.

One of the main advantages of such a work as this, consists in the inducements which it holds out to a young man to think for himself. The books to which it draws his attention belong to that high class which stamp the character of the age to which they belong, and which influence more or less the judgment of all succeeding times.

"I have not," says the bishop to his son, "recommended to you a greater variety of theological works than you may easily study; for a *helluo librorum* is not always a correct scholar, and very seldom a sound reasoner. You will observe, too, that except the most ancient Fathers of the church, the divines, whose works I have recommended to you, have been almost all of our own church; and I have confined myself to them, because they are generally the safest and most learned guides that a young man can have in the commencement of his theological studies."

ART. III.—*History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy in the Sixteenth Century, including a Sketch of the History of the Reformation in the Grisons.* By Thomas M'Cree, D.D. Cadell. London. 1827. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

IN tracing the history of the Reformation in the several nations of Europe, we are apt to forget that any attempt was ever made in Italy or Spain to reduce the extravagant pretensions of the Pope, and to bring back the doctrines and worship of the Church to the primitive model of Christian institution. The success of the reformers in Germany and Britain has been recorded in the various changes which they accomplished, as well as in the struggle which they had to encounter. Though dead, their works yet speak. They have left monuments of their wisdom, their perseverance and their patriotism, against which no power has hitherto prevailed, and of which no length of time can diminish the value. But in the Italian republics, the workings of that rising spirit which distinguished the beginning of the sixteenth century are only to be found perpetuated in the martyrology of private families which sank under the tyranny of an ignorant priesthood, or in the annals of such oppressed and unhappy sects as were doomed to sustain the failure of their generous designs, and to transmit through several generations the sorrow and disappointments which clouded their last efforts in behalf of civil and religious liberty. Unfortunately, as Dr. M'Cree remarks, none of the Italian Protestants, at the period to which we now allude, thought of recording the facts connected with the religious movement which issued in their expulsion from their native country; while, on the other hand, writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion appear to have agreed, from the very outset, to pass over a subject at once ungrateful and dangerous; or if they did touch it, to represent any agitation which took place as exceedingly slight and transient, and as produced by a few individuals of no note or consideration, who had suffered themselves to be led astray by fondness for novelty. Facts which contradicted this representation were, indeed, to be found in writings composed during the crisis; but these were afterwards carefully suppressed: and the Index Expurgatorius of Rome was itself reformed in some instances, with the view of preventing it from being known that certain individuals had once been braided with the stigma of heresy.

It is well known that the establishment of the papal supremacy met with greater obstacles in Italy than in many of the remoter churches of the West. It was not till the eleventh century that the Bishop of Milan consented to acknowledge the superiority of the Roman See, and to receive the archiepiscopal pall from the

capital of the Christian world. Even in matters of doctrine and of ritual usage the authority of the pontiff was occasionally called in question. Claud, Bishop of Turin, who flourished in the ninth century, distinguished himself, not only by his judicious commentaries on the Scriptures, but also by his vigorous opposition to the worship of images and pilgrimages to Rome. But the innovations of the Vaudois or Waldenses, which about the middle of the twelfth century extended into Italy, carried with them the cause of a more serious and lasting disturbance than the ecclesiastical sovereign had yet been compelled to experience. In the year 1231, Pope Gregory IX. published against them a furious bull, ordaining that they should be sought out and delivered to the secular arm to be punished, and that such as harboured them should be declared infamous, even to the second generation of their descendants. Notwithstanding the persecutions to which they were exposed, the Waldenses kept their ground in Italy; they maintained a regular correspondence with their brethren in other countries; and in the fourteenth century they had academies in Lombardy, which were frequented by the youth and supported by the contributions of churches professing the same faith in Poland and Bohemia. At a somewhat later period they established a colony in Calabria; which gradually increased by the successive arrival of such members of their body as were compelled to retire from France and Piedmont; which continued to flourish when the Reformation dawned upon Italy; and which, after having existed nearly two centuries, was at length barbarously exterminated by the vindictive jealousy of the papal government.

The revival of literature paved the way, even beyond the Alps, for the introduction of opinions which could not fail in due time to bring forth the fruits of a practical reformation. A taste for letters, it is true, does not necessarily imply a taste for religion; and many of those, accordingly, who promoted the interests of the former, were among the most devoted to the support of ancient error and superstition. It was impossible, however, to check the progress of the light which had been struck out, or to prevent the new spirit of inquiry from taking a direction towards religion and the Church.

“ Among other books which had long remained unknown or neglected, copies of the sacred writings in the original languages, with the works of the Christian Fathers, were now eagerly sought out, printed, and circulated, both in the original and in translations; nor could persons of ordinary discernment and candour peruse these without perceiving that the Church had declined far from the Christian standard and the model of primitive purity, in faith worship, and morals. This truth forced it-

self even on the minds of those who were interested in the support of the existing corruptions. They felt that they stood on unsolid ground, and trembled to think that the secret of their power had been discovered, and was in danger of becoming every day better and more extensively known. This paralysed the exertions which they made in their own defence, and was a principal cause of that dilatory, vacillating and contradictory procedure which characterized the policy of the court of Rome in its first attempts to check the progress of the reformed opinions. From the earliest dawn of letters the corruptions of the Roman Church had been discovered by persons who entertained no thought of renouncing her communion. Besides the severe allusions which he has made to this subject in different parts of his immortal poem, Dante wrote a treatise in defence of the Emperor against the papal claims, in which he proves that the imperial power was undivided and independent of the Roman See ; speaks disrespectfully of the reigning Pope, as a decretalist and no divine ; and inveighs against his predecessors and their defenders, as notorious for ambition, avarice and imprudence, and as persons who showed themselves to be children of iniquity and the devil, while they boasted that they were sons of the Church. Petrarch and Boccaccio employed, each in his own style, their wit and humour in exposing the frauds and lashing the vices of the clergy, not sparing the dignitaries of the Church and the sovereign pontiffs themselves. They were followed by others of their countrymen, both in prose and verse ; and the lampoons against priests and friars, which became common in other countries, were imitations, and in many instances translations, of those of the Italian poets and satirists."

But although the people of Rome had their eyes opened as well to the vices of the clergy as to the corruptions of their ecclesiastical system, there were several powerful causes at work which prevented the effects which such a discovery might have been expected to produce. The principal of these were national vanity and a regard to interest. The removal of the papal court to Avignon had greatly diminished the wealth and importance of the city of Rome. After the return of the popes to their ancient seat, and the revival of the pontificate from the deadly wound inflicted on it by the schism of the anti-popes, the Romans congratulated themselves on the recovery of their former distinction. In this feeling their countrymen in general participated ; and the passion for political liberty by which they had been animated having subsided, they seemed to think that the loss of the ancient glory which Italy once enjoyed, as the mistress of the world, was compensated by the flattering station to which she was now raised, as the head of Christendom. When the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle attacked the corruptions of the Roman court, and sought to abridge its extensive authority, the Italians were induced to come forward in its defence. They felt themselves dishonoured as a nation by the invectives which the reformers of that age pro-

nounced against the Italian vices of the pontiffs, and they saw that the reforms which were so eagerly pressed would cut off or drain those pecuniary resources by which they hoped to be enriched. The popes were careful to foster this spirit. By a system of artful policy the bishops of Rome had taken care that the power which they had gradually acquired over all the nations of the west should not be empty or unproductive. The wealth of Europe continued to flow in various channels to Rome, from which it was distributed through Italy. There was hardly a state or town which did not, in one way or another, depend on the papal court; nor a prince or great family which had not some of its relations in offices connected with its extended administration. The greater part of the learned either held benefices or enjoyed pensions which they drew from the patronage of the chief bishop. Italy, it has been well remarked, was a land of priests, and in consequence of the influence which the court of Rome had come to exert in the political affairs of Europe during the fifteenth century, almost every sovereign strove to procure for some one of his family, or among the more powerful of his subjects, a seat in the sacred college, and this was usually purchased by the gift of the richest benefices within his kingdom to those who, from their situations or connexions, had it most in their power to serve his interests. When these things, says Dr. M'Cree, are taken into consideration, it will be matter of surprise that the reformed doctrine made so much progress in Italy as we find it to have made; and we are able to account for the mistake into which some writers, guided by theory rather than fact, have fallen, when they assert that it had few or no converts in that country.

The circumstances which we have just detailed apply chiefly to the condition of things which preceded any direct attempt to introduce the principles of the Reformation into the Italian states. The fire which was kindled in Germany found its way across the Alps on the occasion of a controversy excited by the zeal of John Reuchlin, or Capnio, a learned man of Suabia, who exerted himself to prevent the execution of a barbarous decree, obtained from the imperial chamber, ordaining that all Jewish books, the Bible alone excepted, should be committed to the flames, as being filled with blasphemies against Christ. His successful opposition exposed him to the resentment of the monks, and sentence was pronounced against him, first by the divines of Cologne, and afterwards by the doctors of the Sorbonne. Reuchlin appealed to Rome, and the friends of learning there determined to support his cause, as one common to all the patrons of liberty and genius. Erasmus and other distinguished persons in Germany wrote warmly in his favour to certain members of the Sacred College, on

whose countenance or forbearance they could rely; while the regular clergy, on the other hand, strove with equal zeal to defeat a party which they had long hated, and from whom they now felt that they had much to dread. No cause for a long time had excited so general an interest. On the one side were ranked the monks, the most devoted clients of the papal throne; on the other, the men who had attracted the admiration of Europe by their talents and the splendour of their various writings. The papal sanhedrim, indeed, with its usual policy, protracted its deliberations till both parties were tired; and, unwilling to offend either, abstained from gratifying the natural desire of the priesthood by enforcing the imperial ordonnance against the advocates of free opinions. Silence was at length enjoined on both the contending factions; but the cause had already excited so deep an interest on the south as well as on the north side of the Alps, that the voice of authority was uttered in vain. Luther had taken part with Reuchlin, and, in return, some of the most ardent and intrepid defenders of the Suabian in Italy declared in favour of the religious views recommended by the reformer.

It deserves to be noted, that soon after the revival of learning there prevailed very generally throughout the Roman Catholic Church a desire, not only to cultivate the study of sacred literature, which had been too long neglected, but also to introduce into the Church many alterations in point of discipline and worship, which the change of times had suggested, and even rendered expedient. Many of the higher clergy encouraged the spirit of research which had begun to animate all classes of men. They lent their countenance, and the still more efficient aid of funds, in order to increase, by means of the press, the copies of such works as were best calculated to open up to the mind of the biblical student a clear view of Christian antiquity, as also an accurate knowledge of the sciences, literature and arts of those accomplished nations among whom the gospel was first promulgated. Nor were the doctrines of the reformers received at the first without such a degree of favour as ingenious men, willing to discover the truth, are wont to confer on the labours of their contemporaries. Even those who already regarded with jealousy and fear the ulterior designs of the Lutherans, bestowed upon their speculations an equal share of attention and praise.

“ In spite of the terror of pontifical bulls, and the activity of those who watched over their execution, the writings of Luther and Melancthon, Zuingle and Bucer, continued to be circulated and read with great avidity and delight in all parts of Italy. Some of them were translated into the Italian language, and, to elude the vigilance of the inquisitors, were published under disguised or fictitious names, by which means they

made their way into Rome, and even into the palace of the Vatican ; so that bishops and cardinals sometimes unwittingly read and praised works, which, on discovering their real authors, they were obliged to pronounce dangerous and heretical. The elder Scaliger relates an incident of this kind which happened when he was at Rome. Cardinal Seraphin, says he, who was at that time counsellor of the papal Rota, came to me one day, and said ' We have had a most laughable business before us to-day. The Common Places of Philip Melancthon were printed at Venice with this title, *par Messer Ippofilo da Terra Negra*. These Common Places being sent to Rome, were freely bought for the space of a whole year, and read with great applause ; so that the copies being exhausted, an order was sent to Venice for a fresh supply. But in the meantime a Franciscan friar, who possessed a copy of the original edition, discovered the trick, and denounced the book as a Lutheran production, from the pen of Melancthon. It was proposed to punish the poor printer, who probably could not read one word of the book ; but at last it was agreed to burn the copies and suppress the whole affair.' "

This anecdote shows, at least, that there were among the clergy a disposition to inquire and a wish to be informed ; and it is not improbable that in the number of those who purchased the Common Places, there were many who knew the real author, though their zeal did not transport them to the same pitch of intolerance to which the Franciscan friar allowed himself to be carried. Luther's preface to the Romans, and his treatise on Justification, were eagerly read for some time as the productions of Cardinal Fregoso—a proof that it was not thought extraordinary that a cardinal should write such treatises, or deemed improper in good Catholics to read them. The works of Zuingle were circulated under the name of Coricius Cogelius ; and several editions of Martin Bucer's Commentary on the Psalms were sold in Italy and France as the work of Aretius Felinus.

The attention and encouragement bestowed on sacred literature, especially the original languages of the Scriptures, were such as would have done honour to the mature age of the Reformation. In 1477 the Psalter appeared in Hebrew ; and about eleven years after a complete impression of the whole Bible, in that language, was brought out at Soncino by a family of Jews, who, under the adopted name of Soncinati, established printing-presses in various parts of Europe, including Constantinople. This department of typography, our author remarks, was almost entirely engrossed by the Jews in Italy until the year 1518, when an edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, accompanied with various readings and Rabbinical commentaries, proceeded from the splendid press which David Bomberg had recently erected at Venice. The first edition of the Septuagint came from the Aldine press in 1518, under the direction of Andrew of Asolo. In 1516, Erasmus

published at Basil his edition of the Greek text of the New Testament, accompanied by a Latin translation executed by himself; to which his fame gave an extensive currency in Italy. And in 1527, Sante Pagnini, of Lucca, published his Latin translation of the whole Bible, which had excited great expectations from the reputation which the author enjoyed as a Hebrew scholar, and its being known that he had spent upwards of twenty-five years on the work. These various editions of the sacred volume were followed by many valuable treatises in the form of commentaries and illustrations, which are still highly esteemed by biblical writers.

It is not necessary to pay a minute attention to the several works which at that period awakened the curiosity and purified the faith of many members of the priesthood at Rome; but there can be no doubt that, by means of the studies already mentioned, the minds of the learned in Italy at large were turned to the Scriptures, and prepared for taking part in the religious controversy which arose. Individuals in the conclave, such as Egidio, Fregoso, and Alexander, were skilled in the sacred tongues, which were now studied in the palaces of bishops and in the cells of monks. "All were not concerned to become acquainted with the treasures hid in those books which they turned over by night and by day, and still less were they led by them to renounce a system to which, among other secular advantages, they owed their literary leisure; but neither, on the one hand, were men disposed at that period, as they were at a subsequent one, to employ sacred criticism as an art to invent arguments for supporting existing abuses; and there were always individuals from time to time, whose minds welcomed the truth or were accessible to conviction." Accordingly we shall find among the converts to the reformed doctrine, men eminent for their literary attainments, the rank which they held in the Church, and the character which they had obtained for piety in those orders to which the epithet religious had long been appropriated. The reformers appealed from the fallible and conflicting opinions of the doctors of the Church to the infallible dictates of revelation, and from the Vulgate version of the Scriptures to the Hebrew and Greek originals; and in these appeals they were often supported by the translations recently made by persons of acknowledged orthodoxy, and published with the permission and warm recommendations of the Head of the Church. In surveying this portion of history, it is impossible not to admire the arrangements of Providence, when we perceive monks, and bishops, and cardinals, and popes, active in forging and polishing those weapons which were soon to be turned against themselves, and which they afterwards would fain have blunted, and laboured to decry as unlawful and empoisoned.

Nothing can be more entertaining to a Protestant reader than to find that the prophetic language, which has since been so often, and sometimes so very foolishly, applied to the Church of Rome, was first adopted by one of her own children. Upon the occupation of the Castle of St. Angelo by the troops of Charles V. Staphylo, the Bishop of Sibari, is said to have addressed the apostolical Rota in the following terms:—

“ But whence, I pray you, have these things proceeded; and why have such calamities befallen us? Because all flesh have corrupted their ways; because we are citizens, not of the holy city Rome, but of Babylon, the wicked city. The word of the Lord spoken by Isaiah is accomplished in our times. ‘How is the faithful city become a harlot! It was full of judgment and holiness, righteousness formerly dwelt in it; now sacriligious persons and murderers. Formerly it was inhabited by a holy nation and a peculiar people; but now by the people of Gomorrah, a depraved seed, wicked children, unfaithful priests, the companions of thieves.’ Lest any should suppose that this prophetic oracle was fulfilled long ago in the overthrow of the Babylonish Jerusalem by the Roman emperors, Vespasian and Titus, seeing the words appear to refer to the time in which the prophet lived, I think it proper to observe, agreeably to ecclesiastical verity, that future things were set before the eyes of the prophet’s mind as present. This is evident from the sacred writings throughout: ‘The daughter of Zion shall be forsaken and made desolate by the violence of the enemy.’ This daughter of Zion, the Apostle John, in the book of Revelations, explains as meaning, not Jerusalem, but the city Rome, as appears from looking into his description; for John, or rather the angel explaining to John the vision concerning the judgment of the whore, represents this city as meant by Babylon. ‘The woman,’ says he, ‘whom thou sawest, is that great city which reigns’—he refers to a spiritual reign—‘over the kings of the earth.’ He says, ‘she sits on seven hills,’ which applies properly to Rome, called from ancient times, the *seven-hilled city*. She is also said to ‘sit on many waters,’ which signify people, nations, and various languages, of which, as we see, this city is composed more than any other city in the Christian world. He says also, ‘she is full of names of blasphemy, the mother of uncleanness, fornications, and abominations of the earth.’ This supercedes the necessity of any more specific proof that Rome is the city referred to, seeing these vices, though they prevail everywhere, have fixed their seat and empire with us.”

Father Paul, in his *History of the Council of Trent*, speaks much to the same purpose.

“ In Italy,” says he, “ as most men looked on the calamities which had fallen on the Pope and papal court as the execution of a divine judgment, many listened with avidity to the Reformation. In several cities, and particularly at Faenza, which was situated within the territories of the Pope, sermons were delivered in private houses against the Church of Rome; and the number of those named *Lutherans*, or, as they called themselves, *Evangelicals*, increased every day. Even the Pope, Cle-

ment VII. himself, could not refrain from acknowledging with grief of heart, that in different parts of Italy the pestiferous heresy of Luther prevailed to a great degree, not only among secular persons, but also among ecclesiastics and the regular clergy; so that some, by their discourses and conversation, and what was worse, by their public preaching, infected numbers with this disease, and greatly scandalized faithful Christians living under the obedience of the Roman Church, to the increase of heresies, the stumbling of the weak, and the no small injury of the Catholic faith."—*Fra Paolo, Hist. du Con. et Raynaldi Annales.*

It is manifest, notwithstanding, that if the reformers had not enjoyed the countenance of certain sovereign states, their efforts against the See of Rome could neither have been so long continued, nor crowned with such important results. Fortunately for the cause of literature, as well as of religion, the illustrious House of Este protected the spirit of inquiry which had gone forth among the Italians. In 1527 Hercules II. married Renée, daughter of Louis XII. of France—a princess distinguished not less by her elegant manners, than by her extensive acquirements in ancient and modern learning. Before leaving her native country she had become acquainted with the reformed doctrines, by means of some of those learned persons who frequented the court of the celebrated Margaret, Queen of Navarre; and she was desirous to facilitate their introduction into the country to which her residence was now transferred. For some time she could only do this under the pretext of entertaining the friends of the Reformation as men of letters, whom the duke, her husband, was at all times ready to encourage; and among the first to whom she thus extended her protection and hospitality were her own countrymen, whom the violence of persecution had driven out of France. About the year 1534 the celebrated John Calvin visited Ferrara, where he spent some months under the assumed name of Charles Hepperville. He received the most distinguished attention from the duchess, who was confirmed in the Protestant faith by his instructions, and ever after retained the highest respect for his character and talents.

“ We have no means of ascertaining the number of Protestants at Ferrara, who probably varied at different times, in consequence of the fluctuating policy of the duke, and the measures of religious restraint or toleration which were alternately adopted by the other states of Italy. One account mentions that they had several preachers as early as the year 1528; but whether they were permitted to teach publicly or not, we are not informed. That their labours were successful is evident from the number of distinguished persons who either imbibed the Protestant doctrine, or were confirmed in their attachment to it at Ferrara. To the instances of this among the natives of France, already mentioned, may be added Hubert Langnet—an accomplished scholar, and one of the

first, or at least soundest, politicians of his age. The most eminent of the Italians who embraced the reformed faith, or who exposed themselves to the suspicions of the clergy by the liberality of their opinions, resided for some time at the court of Ferrara, or were indebted in one way or other to the patronage of Renée."

Modena was also under the government of the House of Este, and most probably owed its first acquaintance with the reformed opinions to the same cause which introduced them into Ferrara. It possessed one of those academies which sprang up in such great numbers in Italy during the sixteenth century, and threw into shade the old and endowed seminaries of science. This institution did not escape the suspicion of being tainted with heresy, as early as 1537, on account of a book circulated in the city which had been condemned as heretical, but which the academicians defended as sound and worthy of approbation. In 1540, Paolo Ricci, a native of Sicily, who had imbibed the reformed doctrine, came to Modena, where his reputation for learning secured him a cordial reception. He made it his business to find out the friends of the new opinions, who were scattered in the city; and having prevailed on them to meet privately in a particular house, he acted as their teacher. His instructions soon made additional converts, and gathering courage with their numbers, the new preachers mounted the pulpit, and drew crowds to their sermons. This produced a great sensation in the city. The Scriptures were eagerly consulted, and the subjects in dispute between the Church of Rome and her opponents were freely and generally canvassed. Persons of all classes, to use the words of a contemporary popish writer, not only the learned, but also the illiterate and the women, whenever they met in the streets, in shops, or in churches, disputed about faith and the law of Christ; and all promiscuously tortured the sacred Scriptures, quoting Paul, Matthew, John, the Apocalypse, and all the doctors, though they never saw their writings.

Florence and Bologna were not less interested in the cause of evangelical purity than either Modena or Ferrara. The university of the latter city was one of the earliest of the great schools of Europe, and the extensive privileges enjoyed by its members were favourable to liberal sentiments, and the propagation of the new opinions in religion. The essential principles of liberty were boldly avowed in public disputations before the students, at a time when they had fallen into neglect even in those other states of Italy which still retained a shadow of their former freedom. The desire of ecclesiastical reform was strongly and generally felt, not only by the Bolognese, but by the greater part of the surrounding cities. Averse to the holding of a general council, and yet un-

able to evade the importunities of those who demanded it, Pope Paul III. in 1537, assembled four cardinals and five bishops at Rome, and charged them, after due deliberation, to lay before him their advice as to the best method of reforming the abuses of the Church. The members of this commission, including some of the most respectable dignitaries of the ancient communion, met accordingly, and presented their joint advice to his holiness. Though they touched with a gentle hand the sores of the ecclesiastical body, they acknowledged that both head and members laboured under a "pestiferous malady, which, if not cured, would unquestionably prove fatal." Among the evils which called for a speedy remedy, they pointed out the admission of improper persons into the priesthood, the sale of benefices, the disposition of them by testaments, the granting of dispensations and exemptions, the union of bishoprics, and of the incompatible offices of Cardinal and Bishop. Addressing the supreme pontiff, they say, "Some of your predecessors in the pontifical chair, having itching ears, have heaped to themselves teachers according to their own lusts, not men who would instruct them what they ought to do, but such as were expert in finding out means to justify what they wished to do, and who, by adulation, persuaded the Pope that he was the proprietor of all benefices, and might sell them without being guilty of simony."

"No one acquainted with the politics of the court of Rome, will suppose that it was serious in the proposal to reform even these abuses. The advice was approved of, and printed by the order of Paul III.; but instead of seeing it carried into execution, he glaringly transgressed its provisions in various instances. Nor did the advisers themselves testify any forwardness to exemplify their own rules. Such of them as were both cardinals and bishops, retained their double office. Cardinal Pole did not think it necessary to lay aside the purple when he became primate of all England; and Cardinal Caraffa, when he afterwards ascended the Papal throne, under the title of Paul IV., put the advice which he had given to his predecessor into the list of prohibited books. The Protestants, however, did not overlook this document. A copy of the advice being sent to Germany, it was published in Latin with a prefatory epistle by Sturmius, rector of the academy of Strasburg; and in German by Luther, accompanied with animadversions, in which, among other satirical remarks, he says that the cardinals contented themselves with removing the small twigs, while they allowed the trunk of corruption to remain unmolested; and, like the Pharisees of old, strained at flies, and swallowed camels. To set this before the eyes of his readers, he prefixed to his book a print, in which the pope was represented as seated on a high throne, surrounded by the Cardinals, who held in their hands long poles with foxes' tails fixed to them like brooms, with which they swept up and down the room."

The policy of Paul III. was questioned, and not without reason, by several influential members of his church, and chiefly on the ground that, by "ordering a reformation of manners, he acknowledged that depravity existed, and thereby added force to the detracting speeches which heretics circulated among the vulgar." The stirring spirit of reformation, soon extended itself to other parts of Italy, and we find that at Faenza and Imola, the authority of Luther, in the former half of the sixteenth century, stood higher than that of his holiness the pope. Venice, too, made haste to enrol herself among the supporters of the new opinions. Jealous of its authority, indeed, and well apprized of the ambitious and encroaching spirit of the Roman court, the Venetian senate had uniformly resisted the attempts made to establish the Inquisition, and was ever cautious in allowing the edicts of the Vatican to be promulgated or carried into effect within their territories. In 1542, the evangelical doctrine had made such progress, that its friends, who had hitherto met in private for mutual instruction and religious exercises, held deliberations on the propriety of organising themselves into regular congregations, and assembling in public. Several members of the senate were favourable to it, and hopes were entertained at one time, that the authority of the distinguished body just named would be interposed in its behalf. The Milanese, in like manner, afforded many adherents to the reformed doctrine. Two causes contributed to produce this effect. The first was their vicinity to Piedmont and Savoy, where the remains of the persecuted Vaudois had long found a refuge. The second was the unsettled state of the duchy, in consequence of the protracted contest for its sovereignty between Francis I. and Charles V. and its alternate occupation by the armies of the two monarchs; on account of which the efforts of the reformers were overlooked. Pope Paul III. in a brief addressed to the bishop of Modena, in the year 1536, states, that he was informed that there had lately been discovered in the religious and illustrious state of Milan some conventicles, consisting of noble persons of both sexes, in which many heresies, condemned by the Church, were fostered. His holiness therefore commands the bishop, who was then at Milan, to make inquisition after these conventicles and heretics, and to see that condign punishment be inflicted on the guilty, so that the pravity sown by the devil might be extirpated, before it had time to shoot up and strengthen.

In proportion as the reader advances into Dr. M'Cree's volume, he will find that the author, relinquishing the discussion of general principle, and the narrative of historical events, devotes his cares to the detail of personal adventure, and to the minute

descriptions of biographical incident. We hear the praises of Ochino, the favourite preacher of the Venetians; of Pietro Martire Vermigli, the glory of Florence; and of John Mollio, the leader and patriarch of the faithful among the Neapolitans. The first of these employed his persuasive eloquence in the pulpit, while the two latter read lectures, chiefly on the epistles of St. Paul, which were attended by the monks of different convents, by many of the nobility, and by individuals of the episcopal order. But we cannot follow the doctor through his minute commemoration of men, who, whatever might be their zeal or their talents, are known in our days only for their unsuccessful endeavours to oppose the corruptions of a church which they were unwilling to abandon, and for the enforcement of particular points of evangelical truth which they did not understand as a system. At Lucca, Sienna, Locarno, Istria, Genoa, Verona, Brescia, Civita de Friuli, and several other places, we meet with decided tokens of a good spirit and with the most flattering prospects of a happy issue. Istria was the last spot which the light of the reformation visited in its progress through Italy, and is farther deserving of notice in that it gave birth to two distinguished Protestants, both of whom were bishops of the Roman Catholic church, and one of them a papal legate. Vergerio was the name of the two brothers now alluded to, who, having studied the German doctrine on the subject of justification, resolved to place the faith of the people under their care, on the sure basis of the Gospel, by withdrawing their minds from those ceremonial services and bodily exercises which they were disposed to identify with the sum of religion. This they were able to effect in a good degree by their own personal labours, and by the assistance of some individuals who had previously received the knowledge of the truth; so that before the year 1546, a great part of the inhabitants of that district had embraced the reformed faith, and made considerable advances in the knowledge of Christian doctrine.

We have already observed, that the doctrines of the reformation were favourably received by many learned and dignified clergymen, who, though desirous to see various changes introduced into the opinions and ritual services of their brethren, opposed the establishment of a rival communion, as not less dangerous to Christianity at large, than incompatible with their leading maxim, respecting the unity of the Church. Of this mode of thinking, among a numerous class of enlightened Italians, we have an example in Celio Calcagnini, one of the most learned men of that age. His friend Peregrino Morata had sent him a book in defence of the reformed doctrine, and requested his opi-

nion of it. The reply of Colcagnini was cautious, but sufficiently intelligible.

“I have read,” says he, “the book relating to the controversies so much agitated at present; I have thought on its contents, and weighed them in the balance of reason. I find in it nothing which may not be approved and defended, but some things which, as mysteries, it is safer to suppress and conceal, than to bring before the common people, inasmuch as they pertained to the primitive and infant state of the Church. Now, when the decrees of the fathers, and long usage, have introduced other modes, what necessity is there for reviving antiquated practices, which have long fallen into desuetude, especially as neither piety nor the salvation of the soul is concerned with them. Let us then, I pray you, allow these things to rest. Not that I disapprove of their being embraced by scholars and lovers of antiquity; but I would not have them communicated to the common people, and those who are fond of innovations, lest they give occasion to strife and sedition. There are unlearned and unqualified persons, who, after long ignorance, having read or heard certain new opinions respecting baptism, the marriage of the clergy, ordination, the distinction of days and food, and public penitence, instantly conceive that these opinions are to be stiffly maintained and observed. Wherefore, in my opinion, the discussion of these points ought to be confined to the initiated, that so the seamless coat of our Lord may not be rent and torn. It was this consideration, I suppose, which moved those good men who lately laid before pope Paul a plan for reforming Christianity, to advise that the *Colloquies* of Erasmus should be banished from our republic, as Plato formerly banished the poems of Homer from his.”

In reference to the doctrine of predestination, taught by the author of the book in question, he observes,

“Seeing it is dangerous to treat such things before the multitude and in public discourses, I must deem it safest to ‘speak with the many, and think with the few,’ and to keep in mind the advice of St. Paul, ‘Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God.’”

This caution on the part of a high official character, however much it may be supposed to savour of worldly prudence, will not be hastily condemned by those who take a near view of the circumstances which marked the progress of the Reformation on both sides of the Alps. On two most important subjects, the Lord's Supper and the doctrine of the Trinity, the Protestants unfortunately differed to a very great extent. In regard to the former of these mysteries, Luther and Zuingle, it is well known, took very opposite views; the one insisting that the words of institution ought to be understood in a literal sense, while the other interpreted them figuratively. At a conference held at Marburg in the year 1529, and procured chiefly by the influence of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, the two parties, after ascertaining that their

sentiments harmonized on all other points, agreed to bear with each other, and to cultivate mutual peace and good will, notwithstanding their different views of this single article. But the controversy broke out afresh, chiefly through the ill offices of some forward and injudicious friends of Luther, and being inflamed by publications on both sides, laid the foundation of a lasting division between the churches of Switzerland and Upper Germany. After the death of Zuingle, his opinions were vigorously defended by Ecolampadius, Bullinger, and Calvin. The Italian Protestants, it would appear, were generally favourable to the doctrine of the Swiss reformer. This may be concluded, both from their writings and from the fact, that by far the greater number of those who were obliged to leave their native country sought an asylum in the Protestant cantons of Switzerland. There is no doubt that this dispute was warmly agitated at Modena, Bologna, and other parts of Italy, in 1541; in the course of which year several letters were addressed to the churches there by the celebrated Bucer, who had all along acted as a strenuous friend to both parties, and endeavoured to revive amongst them the spirit of unity and concord. The fierce temper of Luther proved a great bar to the reconciliation which might have been effected. In writing to the Protestants of Venice, he inveighed, in the most bitter terms, against the Sacramentarians and Fanatics, as he chose to call the Swiss divines; and asserted that the Popish tenet of transubstantiation was more tolerable than that of Zuingle. Nor did he show greater moderation in a letter written by him in the following year, in which he urged the Italians to engage in a controversy with the disciples of Zuingle and Ecolampadius; whom he did not fail to stigmatize as *poisonous teachers and false prophets*, who did not dispute under the influence of error, but opposed the truth knowingly, at the *instigation of Satan*.

The Protestants of Italy were still further divided by an unhappy controversy on the doctrine of the Trinity; including the usual questions which respect the person of Christ and faith in the atonement, and consequently most of the articles of belief which are peculiar and distinguishing in the Christian creed. Socinian writers have fixed the origin of the sect at the period now under consideration. According to their account, upwards of forty individuals of great talents and learning were in the habit of meeting in private conferences, or colleges, within the territories of Venice, to deliberate on the plan of forming a purer faith, by discarding a number of opinions held by Protestants as well as by Papists; but these meetings, being discovered by the treachery of an individual, were dispersed in the year 1546; some of the members having been thrown into prison, and others forced

to flee into foreign countries. Among the latter were Lælius Socinus, Camillus Siculus, Franciscus Niger, Ochino, Alciati, Gentilis, and Blandoata. These writers have gone so far as to present us with a creed, or system of doctrine, agreed upon by the members of the College, or Conference, just mentioned; but historians of the best credit have rejected this narrative, as well because it is extremely improbable when viewed in connexion with the general state of things at the period to which it refers, as because it is notoriously inconsistent with certain facts which admit not of any doubt.

“ But while there is no good ground for thinking that the favourers of the Anti-trinitarian tenets in Italy had formed themselves into societies, or digested a regular system of belief, it is undeniable that a number of the Italian Protestants were, at the time referred to, infected with these errors; and it is highly probable that they were accustomed to confirm one another in the belief of them when they occasionally met, and perhaps to introduce them as topics of discussion into the common meetings of the Protestants, and, by starting objections, to shake the convictions of such as adhered to the commonly received doctrines. This was exactly the line of conduct pursued by them after they left their native country, especially in the Grisons, where the expatriated Italians first took refuge. Soon after their arrival, disputes took place in the Grison churches respecting the Trinity, the merits of Christ's death, the perfection of the saints in this life, the necessity and use of the sacraments, infant baptism, the resurrection of the body, and similar articles, in which the chief opponents of the common doctrine, both privily and openly, were natives of Italy, several of whom afterwards propagated their peculiar opinions in Transylvania and Poland. Subsequently to the year 1546, adherents to Anti-trinitarianism were still to be found in Italy. Such of them as had fled maintained a correspondence with their friends at home, and made converts to their opinions by means of their letters. About the year 1543, the learned visionary William Postel published at Venice an apology for Servetus, in which he mentions that this heresiarch had many favourers among the Italians. And in 1555, Pope Paul IV. issued a bull against those who denied the doctrine of the Trinity, the proper divinity of Christ, and redemption by his blood. I close this part of the subject with the words of a learned and judicious Italian, who left his native country for the Gospel, and laboured with great zeal, and not without success, in opposing the spread of this heresy. ‘It is not difficult to divine,’ says he, ‘whence this evil sprang, and by whom it has been fostered. Spain produced the hen; Italy hatched the eggs; and we in the Grisons now hear the chicks pipe.’”—*Zanchius apud Bock*, p. 415.

The extravagance and heretical pravity of the reformers afford the only apology which can be devised for the violent measures which were adopted by the Roman Catholics, with the view of suppressing the new opinions. It was not till the year 1542 that

the court of Rome became seriously alarmed at the success of their opponents and the increase of conventicles. Pietro Caraffa was the most active among the dignified clergy in pursuing means for the restoration of doctrinal unity. He laid before the sacred college the discoveries which he had made as to the extent to which heresy had taken root at Naples, and in various other parts of Italy: and it was resolved to proceed in the first place against such ecclesiastics as were known to favour it, among whom Ochino and Martyr were the most distinguished. But as these individuals were in possession of great popularity, and had not yet made open defection from the Catholic faith, spies were placed round their persons, and a secret investigation was instituted into their past conduct, with a view of procuring direct evidence of their heretical opinions.

There had long been in Italy, as well as in France, persons called Inquisitors, whose employment it was to conduct the examination of such as were accused of heresy; but they acted under the bishops, to whom the power of regulating the process, and pronouncing judgment, properly belonged. In the early part of the sixteenth century there was no separate and independent court for trying such causes in either of those countries, as there had long been in Spain. The want of such a powerful engine for suppressing free inquiry, and preserving the authority of the Church, had been strongly felt since the new opinions spread so widely in Italy. The bishops were in some instances lukewarm; they were accessible to the claims of humanity, or of friendship; their forms of process were slow and open; and the accused individual often escaped before they could obtain from the civil power the necessary order for his arrest. On these accounts, the creation of a court of Inquisition had been for some years eagerly pressed by the more zealous Romanists, with Cardinal Caraffa at their head, as the only means of preventing Italy from being overrun with false doctrine. Accordingly, Pope Paul III. founded at Rome the congregation of the Holy Office, by a bull dated the first of April, 1543, which granted the title and rights of Inquisitors-general of the Faith to six cardinals, and gave them authority, on both sides of the Alps, to try all causes of heresy, with the power of apprehending and incarcerating suspected persons and their abettors, of whatsoever state, rank, or order; of nominating officers under them, and of appointing inferior tribunals in all the places, with the same or limited powers. In a short time it extended its ramifications to Milan, Venice, and Naples, carrying with it terror and suffering; and we are informed, accordingly, that, with the exception of a few places, the public profession which had been made of the Protestant religion was entirely sup-

pressed. Its friends, no doubt, were still numerous ; many of them were animated by the most ardent attachment to the cause ; they continued to encourage and edify one another in their private meetings ; and it required all the exertions and violence of the Inquisitors, during twenty years, to discover and exterminate them.

“ In spite of the keen search made for them, many Protestants still remained in the city of Venice. In the year 1560, they sent for a minister to form them into a church, and had the Lord's Supper administered to them in a private house. But soon after this, information having been given of their meetings by one of those spies whom the court of Rome kept in its pay, all who failed in making their escape were committed to prison. Numbers fled to the province of Istria ; and after concealing themselves there for some time, a party of them, amounting to twenty-three, purchased a vessel to carry them to a foreign country. Hitherto the senate had not visited the Protestants with capital punishment ; but now they yielded to those counsels which they had so long resisted, and acts of cruelty commenced, which continued for years to disgrace the criminal jurisprudence of the republic. Drowning was the mode of death to which they doomed the Protestants, either because it was less cruel and odious than committing them to the flames, or because it accorded with the customs of Venice. But if the *autos da fé* of the queen of the Adriatic were less barbarous than those of Spain, the solitude and silence with which they were accompanied was calculated to excite the deepest horror. At the dread hour of midnight the prisoner was taken from his cell, and put into a gondola, or Venetian boat, attended only, besides the sailors, by a single priest, to act as confessor. He was rowed out into the sea beyond the Two Castles, where another boat was in waiting. A plank was then laid across the two gondolas, upon which the prisoner, having his body chained, and a heavy stone affixed to his feet, was placed ; and, on a signal given, the gondolas retiring from one another, he was precipitated into the deep.”

We abstain from reciting the cruelties which were inflicted upon the unresisting Protestants at Milan, Naples, Locarno, and several other cities in which the Inquisition was allowed to employ its ruthless emissaries under the cloak of law. Ferrara afforded during a short period an asylum to the reformers : but at length the duchess found herself compelled to make concessions to the Catholics, and thereby deprived of the means of supporting her own faith. Many individuals of high rank were obliged to flee for safety, and even whole tribes and colonies were driven from the land which they had possessed for ages. For example, the Waldenses in Calabria Citeriore had increased in the sixteenth century to four thousand persons, who possessed two towns, Santo Xisto, belonging to the Duke of Monalto, and La Guardia, situate on the same coast. Cut off from intercourse

with their brethren of the same faith, and destitute of the means of education for their pastors, this simple people, at the same time that they observed their own forms of worship, had gradually become habituated to attend on mass, without which they found it difficult to maintain a friendly correspondence with the original inhabitants of the place. Their curiosity was awakened by hearing that a doctrine, bearing a strong affinity to that of their fathers, was propagated in Italy: they eagerly sought to become acquainted with it, and being convinced that they had erred hitherto in countenancing the Popish worship, they applied to their brethren in the valley of Pragela, and to the ministers of Geneva, to obtain teachers to instruct them more perfectly, and organize their churches after the Scripture pattern.

“ No sooner was this known at Rome, than the Sacred College sent two monks into Calabria, to suppress the churches of the Waldenses, and reduce them to the obedience of the Holy See. They appointed a time for the celebration of mass, which they required all the people to attend. But instead of complying with this injunction, the inhabitants in a body quitted the town and retired to the woods, leaving behind them only a few aged persons and children. The monks procured two companies of soldiers to be sent into the woods, who hunted the inhabitants of Santo Xisto like beasts of prey. A part of the fugitives took refuge on a mountain, and having secured themselves on the rocks, demanded a parley with the captain. After entreating him to take pity on them, their wives and children, they said that they and their fathers had inhabited that country for several ages, without having given any person cause to complain of their conduct; that if they could not be allowed to remain in it any longer, without renouncing their faith, they hoped they would be permitted to retire to some other country; that they would go, by sea or land, to any place which their superiors were pleased to appoint; that they would engage not to return; and that they would take no more along with them than what was necessary for their support on the journey, for they were ready to part with their property, rather than do violence to their consciences by practising idolatry. They implored him to withdraw his men, and not oblige them reluctantly to defend themselves, as they could not answer for the consequences if reduced to despair. Instead of listening to this reasonable offer, and reporting it to his superiors, the captain ordered his men to advance by a defile, upon which those on the hill attacked them, killed the greater part, and put the rest to flight. It was immediately resolved to avenge on the whole body this unpremeditated act of resistance on the part of a few. The monks wrote to Naples that the country was in a state of rebellion, upon which the Viceroy despatched several companies of soldiers to Calabria, and to gratify the Pope, followed them in person. On his arrival, listening to the voice of the Inquisitors, he caused a proclamation to be read, delivering Santo Xisto to fire and sword, which obliged the inhabitants to remain in their concealments. By another proclamation he

offered a pardon to the *banniti*, or persons proscribed for crimes, (who are a numerous class in Naples,) on the condition of their assisting in the war against the heretics. This brought a number of desperate characters to his standard, who, being acquainted with the recesses of the woods, tracked out the fugitives, the greater part of whom were slaughtered by the soldiers, while the remainder took refuge in the caverns of the high rocks, where many of them died of hunger. Pretending to be displeased with the severity of military execution, the inquisitors retired to some distance from the place, and cited the inhabitants of La Guardia to appear before them. Encouraged by the reports which they had heard, the people complied; but they had no sooner made their appearance, than seventy of them were seized and conducted in chains to Montalto. They were put to the question by the orders of the inquisitor Panza. Stefano Carlino was tortured till his bowels gushed out. Verminel was kept during eight hours on the instrument called *the hell*, and yet he persisted in denying the calumny with which the reformers were charged. The manner in which those of the tender sex were treated by this brutal inquisitor is too disgusting to be related here. Suffice it to say, that he put sixty females to the torture, the greater part of whom died in prison, in consequence of their wounds remaining undressed."

There is a very interesting chapter on the "Foreign Italian Churches, with Illustrations of the Reformation in the Grisons." The Protestants of the more southern states, deprived of liberty in all its forms, naturally betook themselves to the small republics which were spread over the valleys of the Eastern Alps, where they found at once a kindred people and a language which they could understand. Surrounded by the mountains whence proceed the Rhine and the Inn, secluded from the rest of the world, and occupied either in feeding cattle, or in cultivating a few scattered fields or vineyards, the inhabitants, who came originally from Italy, had preserved their ancient tongue and manners, with little variation, from a period considerably more remote than the Christian era. The Grison League, or Commonwealth, consisted of three distinct states, known by the singular names of the Grey League, the League of God's House, and the League of the Ten Jurisdictions; each of which was composed of a number of smaller communities, which retained the right of managing all its internal affairs, and of sending deputies to the general Diet.

It has been remarked, that in no nation, ancient or modern, have the principles of democracy been carried to such an extent as in the Grison republic; and as the checks necessary to prevent its abuse were not provided by a rude people, smarting under the recent effects of tyranny, its form of government, according to the confession of its own as well as of foreign writers, not only created great dissensions, but led to great corruption and bribery in election to offices, and in the administration of justice. The

corruptions, too, which had overspread the Catholic Church, before the Reformation were to be found in the Grisons, with all the aggravations arising from the credulity of men who were still entirely ignorant of letters. Half a century even after the light of Protestantism had penetrated into the Rhetian valleys, the government found it necessary to issue a decree, ordering that the Roman Catholic priests should recite the Lord's prayer, Apostle's creed and Ten Commandments for the instruction of the people.

Philip Salutz and John Dorfmann have been reputed the first reformers of the Grisons. The latter was a man of learning, sound judgment, and warm piety; to which qualities the former added great dexterity in the management of public business, an invincible command of temper, and uncommon eloquence, both in his native tongue and in Latin. But the conversion of John Frich, parish priest of Mayenfield, was brought about in a singular manner. Being a zealous Catholic, and of great note among his brethren, he had warmly resisted the new opinions. Filled with chagrin and alarm at the progress which he saw them making in his immediate neighbourhood, he repaired to Rome to implore the assistance of his holiness, and to consult him on the best method of preventing his native country from being overrun with heresy. But he was so struck with the irreligion which he observed in the court of Rome, and the ignorance and vice prevailing in Italy, that, upon his return home, he joined the party which he had opposed, and became the reformer of Mayenfield. In his old age he used to say to his friends pleasantly, that he had learned the Gospel at Rome.

About the year 1526, a statute was enacted by the general commissioners of the league, that "it shall be free to all persons of both sexes, and of whatever condition or rank, within the territories of the Grison confederation, to choose, embrace and profess either the Roman Catholic or the Evangelical religion; and that no one shall, publicly or privately, harass another with reproaches, or odious speeches, on account of his religion, under an arbitrary penalty." Where persons had bequeathed sums of money to churches and convents for offering anniversary masses and prayers for their souls, both they and their heirs were declared free from any obligation to make such payments for the future, "because no good ground could be shown for believing that this was of any benefit to the deceased." It was decreed that no new members, male or female, should be admitted into monasteries; that the existing monks should be restrained from begging; and that after appropriating a certain sum for their support during life, the remainder of the funds should be returned to the heirs of those who originally bestowed them. The power of choosing

their respective ministers was given to all parishes. Appeals from secular courts to the jurisdiction of the bishop was strictly prohibited; annats and small tithes were abolished, and the great tithes reduced to a fifth.

In the course of thirty years, about eight hundred exiles had taken shelter in the Grisons, or, to use the language of Dr. M'Cree, had "thrown themselves on the glaciers of the Alps, to escape from the fires of the Inquisition." Their first arrival in the country produced an impression highly favourable to the interests of the Reformation; but the theological dissensions which had weakened the good cause in Italy itself, followed the Protestants to their mountains, and impeded materially the progress of the new opinions. The jealousy of the Catholics, too, aided by the arms of the neighbouring princes, threw a bar in the way of their advancement: but, in spite of all these disadvantages, the seeds of civil and religious freedom were so deeply sown as to defy successfully all the attempts of priest and tyrant to root them out.

We are grateful for the information which Dr. M'Cree has collected respecting the rise and suppression of Protestant opinions in the Italian republics; but we are convinced, at the same time, that a more sedulous inquiry would have brought to light a great mass of materials which still remains concealed from the mere English reader. Perhaps, in the present limited state of our knowledge, the biographical form which the author has adopted was in some degree unavoidable, and, in other respects, certainly, it has its peculiar advantages. Still the narrative labours under the two great evils, of repetition and indistinctness; same facts and views come again and again before the reader, while he finds no small difficulty in referring them to their proper time and place, and in connecting them with the main body of the history. But the work, upon the whole, is no unimportant addition to the ecclesiastical records of the sixteenth century.

ART. IV. — *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke.* By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher, with an Introduction by the Translator, containing an Account of the Controversy respecting the Origin of the Three First Gospels since Bishop Marsh's Dissertation. Taylor. London. 1825. pp. 320. 13s.

SOME years have now elapsed since a short discussion took place in this country as to the origin of the three first of our Gospels. That discussion, we need hardly say, was caused by the publication of a Translation of Michaelis's Introduction to the New

Testament, by the present Bishop of Peterborough, who added to it a variety of acute and learned notes and dissertations, and, among others, a very long one on this curious and important subject. The bishop was, doubtless, led into this discussion by a wide range of reading among the German divines, who, for some twenty years before his work appeared, had been much occupied in arguing the question with all the extraordinary industry and research which characterises that learned nation. They, too, have pursued it down to the present day, without any remission of activity or of ingenuity, while in this country it died away immediately after its first agitation. Whether it was right to lay aside such a question “*dum quid superesset agendum*—whether its extent and its difficulty terrified our English divines, or whether their penetration discovered the hopelessness of arriving at any satisfactory conclusions, we shall not, at this moment, stop to inquire, as we are anxious to prepare our readers for the consideration of the work before us, by presenting them with a succinct account of the state of the question in Germany. We shall begin with briefly reminding them, in the words of the translator of the volume before us, that when certain very remarkable variations and coincidences in matter, language and arrangement had been observed in the three first Evangelists,

“two modes of explanation presented themselves, between which the voices of the learned were long divided. The first was, the hypothesis that the later Evangelists borrowed from the writings of the earlier. This theory of course admitted of a great variety of modifications. Any one of the three might be supposed the original, and either of the other two might be supposed to have drawn from him, and the third from either or both of the two former. The precedence was accordingly assigned in a different order by different critics, and almost every possible shape of the hypothesis found an advocate.”

Eichhorn (*Einleitung*, vol. i. pp. 374, 375, first edit.—p. 394, second edit.) has enumerated five of the possible permutations and combinations of which the case is susceptible, as having obtained defenders either wholly or in part. Thus Storr,* refers Matthew and Luke to Mark; Büsching† sends Matthew and Mark to Luke; Grotius,‡ Mill,§ Wetstein¶ and Townson say that Mark borrowed from Matthew, and Luke from both; Vogel¶ again changes this order, and endeavours to show that Mark drew

* See *Commentt. Theoll.* ed. Velthusen, Kühnöl et Ruperti. Vol. iii. Leips. 1796.

† *Harmonie der Evangelien.* Hamburg, 1766.

‡ *Ad Matt. i. 1.* and *ad Luc. i. 1.*

§ *Proleg.* § 109, 116.

¶ *Præf. in Marc. et Lucam.*

¶ See Gabler's *Journal für auserlesene Theol. Litteratur.*—vol. i. p. 159.

on Luke, and Matthew on both of them; while, last of all, Owen,* Griesbach†, and Ammon,‡ think that Mark copied both Matthew and Luke. This theory was indeed, in one shape or other, the earliest solution offered of the problem, Augustine having spoken of Mark as the epitomizer of Matthew. But, however plausible or ingenious might be the arguments with which it was supported, it did not by any means satisfy the inquiring minds of the German divines.§

“The second mode of explanation which suggested itself was the hypothesis, that all the three Evangelists, or at least two of them, drew from some common source or sources. This hypothesis is likewise sus-

* Observations on the Four Gospels, p. 52.

† Comm. Theoll. vol. i. (1794.) and Comm. Crit. Pt. II. p. 53.

‡ Diss. de Luca Emendatore Matthæi. (Erlangen, 1805.)

§ It may be satisfactory to our readers to have some idea of the grounds on which it was rejected. We give very shortly, and as a specimen only, Eichhorn's objections to the supposition that Mark borrowed from Matthew and Luke.

1. It is supposed that Mark's design was to extract from each of these Gospels what was fit, and to reject what was unfit for his intended readers, assumed to be the Gentiles. Now, Christ's conversations were indisputably the most important for them, far more so than the Miracles, on which the Jews set great value, the Heathen none or very little. Yet Mark omits the Sermon on the Mount, which he must on this hypothesis have seen in Matthew—abbreviates the Parables (Matt. xiii. 34, 35)—omits the discourse in Matt. xviii. 10, 35.—the long series of fragments in Luke ix. 51—xviii. 31, &c. These remarks, we need hardly say, rest entirely on the assumption that Mark's Gospel was written for the Heathen. We do not mean to deny the *probability* of that assumption, but the destruction of one hypothesis by the assumption of another is not a very satisfactory method of proceeding.

2. It is clear that Mark sets much store by miracles; yet he omits many which occur in Matthew and Luke. What could be his object? Hardly brevity; for had he inserted all, his Gospel would still have been very short. Nor could it be the wish to leave out one miracle, when he had given another like it: for he gives both the histories of the miraculous feedings of the multitude. As to brevity, indeed, he is often far more copious and circumstantial than the two he is supposed to copy.

3. The assumption that he wrote for the Gentiles, it is said, accounts for his omitting quotations from the Old Testament found in the beginning of Matthew. How then are we to explain his quotation in the second verse of the Gospel, which he found neither in Matthew nor Luke? Again, this assumption, it is said, accounts for his omission of the end of Judas, as the Heathen could not have heard the report, and he would not wish to inform them of the faults of Jesus's disciples. Why then tell the whole story of Peter's denial?—(We do not see the gist of this latter observation, which appears to militate rather against the notion of Mark having written for the Heathen, than against his having copied Matthew or Luke.)

4. Should we look at particular passages, the difficulties of this hypothesis multiply; for Mark's Gospel is so exceedingly inferior to the others in care, clearness, &c., that it is impossible to believe that he could have them before him.—(Eichhorn Einleitung, vol. i. p. 382—387, 1st ed. p. 402—406, 2d ed.)—The general objection to the theory is thus mentioned by Schleiermacher in the work before us,—(Introd. p. 2)—that no probable law can be discovered to determine the manner in which the later Evangelist, in some passages, repeats the former word for word without addition or abridgment; in others, abridges him; and then again, omits a great deal, or contradicts him, without giving a hint for the satisfaction of the reader (whom he is, nevertheless, supposed elsewhere to refer to his predecessor) as to the ground of the contradiction.

ceptible of many forms. For not only might there be several sources or one, but, if only one, this one might be either oral tradition or a written document; and if the latter, that might either be imagined so copious as to occasion different selections, or so scanty as to occasion different enlargements. All these views—that of several documents prior to our Gospels, that of a common oral tradition, that of a single, large and multifarious original, from which our Evangelists made extracts, and that of a concise outline, which, in its passage through various hands, grew to the size of a little book,—were successively adopted. It was in the last form, that of a short Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic original document, supposed to have constituted the basis of our three first Gospels, that the second hypothesis was introduced into this country by Bishop Marsh, with the modifications which appeared to him necessary to explain all the phenomena of the Gospels.”

As Bishop Marsh's Dissertation has of course been read by every one who takes any interest in the subject, it is the less necessary for us to take up any time in a detailed explanation of the theory of the *concise* original document. We shall content ourselves with a very short sketch of the opinions of Eichhorn, who has presented it in a more extended form than, we believe, any other writer. He conceives that the origin of a written document was simply this: that in the propagation of Christianity, the Apostles would naturally be anxious that their assistants in the work should know exactly what were the circumstances of the life of Jesus, to which they were to appeal in proof of the great point they had to establish, viz. his Messiahship: and these assistants would be equally anxious to possess some written document to which they might appeal in confirmation of their preaching. These feelings dictated the composition of a short document, comprising only what, in the first ages of Christianity, would be thought necessary and essential for the foundation of belief in the new religion; that is to say, probably, a brief sketch of the transactions from the baptism of Jesus to the final separation of Jesus and the Apostles. It would be a straight-forward unartificial sketch, as might be expected from one unpractised in writing, and only anxious to go direct to the establishment of one great point, the Messiahship of Jesus.

The existence of such a document being assumed, Eichhorn goes on to suggest that it furnishes an explanation of the Gospels of the Hebrews, of Marcion, and Cerinthus, of those used by the Apostolical Fathers, the Memorabilia spoken of by Justin,* &c.

* We cannot help taking this opportunity of giving a warning to the readers of Eichhorn as to the admission of his *assertions*. He is anxious to show that the common opinion, “that Justin quoted our Gospels from memory, and that the difference observable between his phraseology, &c. and theirs, is attributable to that style of quotation,” is incorrect. And one proof which he offers is, that when Justin cites from the

He conceives that he can offer sufficient proof from the fragments existing of these books, or supposed books, that they were *not*, as is commonly imagined, derived from our canonical Gospels, while their strong similarity to those works obviously leads to the notion of a common source. Having discussed this point at great length, with the intention and hope of proving that our canonical Gospels did not come into use till the end of the second century, he proceeds to trace the origin of the three first of them, from the same original document as gave rise to the books he has enumerated. He points out forty-four (the translator of the work before us notices only forty-two, *Introd.* p. xxvii.) sections common to the three first Gospels, and determines these to have constituted the original Gospel, written in Aramaic, and giving, in a connected form, (though not always in chronological order,) all the most remarkable passages in the life of our Lord. But as there are many portions common to *two* of the Evangelists only, and unknown to the third, he supposes that various additions were made to the original text, and that some of these augmented copies were translated into Greek. Eichhorn then enters into a most minute and laborious examination of the texts and translations probably seen by each of the three Evangelists, and gives as its result the following table.

- A. An Aramaic Text of the original doctrine, with some of the great additions now found in St. Matthew. This was early translated.
- B. An Aramaic Text, with some of the greater additions now in St. Luke. Not translated independently.
- C. An Aramaic Text compounded of A. and B. This forms St. Mark's

LXX., his quotations are usually quite correct and as near as possible to our present text. This proof would, as the translator of the work before us observes, evidently be good for very little, if the assertion on which it went was correct. But the assertion is utterly and grossly unfounded. The quotations from the LXX. in Justin not only vary widely in words, and in clauses of sentences, from the original, but the order of long passages is varied; different parts of the same writer are mixed (especially in citations from the Psalms,) and what is more, passages from different writers are blended and cited as from the same. We had, in consequence of Eichhorn's observation, made some progress in a general collection of Justin's quotations from the LXX., when we learned from the work before us, that *Winer*, in an academical proluision, had noticed the same fact. We have therefore deferred continuing this collection till we can procure his work. As a specimen, we would mention, that in the *Apology*, (p. 55, ed. Thirlby,) the quotation from Micah, v. 2, is given in the words of St. Matthew; how widely they differ from the LXX. any one may easily see. Again, (in p. 53,) Justin has been obviously misled by his memory, for from the similar run of the phrases in the prophecies in Numbers, xxiv. 17, and Isaiah, xi. 1, and 10, he has actually joined the two. This is the more curious, because he proceeds to argue about Jacob, who is only introduced by this confusion of the two prophecies. We could adduce other instances, besides the first, of cases where Justin has given passages from the LXX. also quoted by St. Matthew, in words far more nearly resembling St. Matthew's citations than the original.

Gospel, having been either translated by himself, or an early translation of it having been revised by him.

- D. An Aramaic Text, with some of the *other* great additions in St. Luke, which was also translated early.
- E. St. Matthew's Aramaic Text, composed out of A. and D., except some additions made by St. Matthew himself, who arranged the whole of the original Gospel and the additions chronologically. The translator of this into Greek used the early translations of A. and D.
- F. St. Luke's Aramaic Text, composed of B. and D. (except some additions peculiar to St. Luke,) and translated by himself, with the assistance of the existing translation of D. B. is thus common to St. Mark and St. Luke, but they had no common translation of it.

Such are the materials with which Eichhorn thinks he could construct our three first Gospels, and satisfactorily account for their variations and coincidences. We shall not detain our readers with pointing out the objections to which this peculiar modification of the hypothesis is liable. But observing that, in one shape or other, it retained its hold on the public mind in Germany for many years, and that it was propounded and defended by men of great talents and learning, by Gratz, for example, by Ziegler, by Weber, by Bertholdt, by Sartorius, and others, we shall point out some of the great objections to it offered both by English writers and in Germany, by Hug, by Schleiermacher, and others: objections so strong, and so founded in reason, as evidently at present to be depriving it of its public credit. They are to be found also scattered through the translator's Introduction to the work before us, and are stated by him with great clearness and force. First of all it is asked by those who object to the theory, whether any reason has been or can be, offered for believing that written documents were, or could be used by the Apostles, as a part of any public or general plan for propagating Christianity? and next, whether any sort of proof has been offered of the actual existence of any such document? On the contrary, whether we look to Eichhorn, or Bishop Marsh, or Bertholdt, or any of the other writers on that subject, we find them all *assuming* its existence, and thinking it perfectly reasonable to do so. Yet, surely, if such a document not only existed, but was so generally known and so highly regarded as is implied in the hypothesis, we may well ask, how comes all trace of it to be lost? If used as the basis of all subsequent accounts, something there must have been to stamp especial value on it. And the loss of so valuable a document is surely to be accounted for by those who maintain its existence. Again, what can we imagine to have been its object, if we look at the document itself, supposed to consist

of the sections common to the three Evangelists? The writer of it must have had some plan and some object! Yet can the most attentive observer divine what that object could be, or imagine to himself any process by which such strange materials, as he will find the document to consist of, could be combined into a whole? Will it be said that he wished to set down what he heard from the Apostles as he heard it, at different times, it may be, and under different circumstances? That supposition is negatived by the slightest inspection of the supposed original document. Then, how are we to account for another fact, equally obvious on the most cursory examination? In most places this document will be found devoid of everything like detail, and so concise as to be almost, perhaps quite, unintelligible by itself; while in some few we are surprised with a strange copiousness of circumstance; so that, as the translator has happily said, this original document "is neither a full body, nor a dry anatomy, but rather presents the appearance of a disjointed skeleton, in which some of the bones are missing, others out of their place, and the interstices are here and there covered with a fragment of skin and flesh." But if such difficulties arise from mere internal consideration of the original document, there are still more serious ones if we look at it, so to speak, externally, and then inquire again, what was the object of the writer in composing such a book at all? Was it for a public or a private purpose? Eichhorn, we have seen, chooses the first alternative, and says it was to serve as a credential. The translator asks, with some justice, whether such a degree of suspicion towards the preachers of the Gospel, as would create a necessity for one, is credible on the part of the early converts? and whether such a document would at all supply it? But letting that pass,—Eichhorn's supposition, and every other* which assumes the public and allowed use of this document by the early preachers of the Gospel, assumes also, that if not composed, it was at least adopted and sanctioned by the Apostles. Now, it is stated not only by Eichhorn, (as we ob-

* Gratz has imagined that the original document was the work of a private person, adopted by the first Preachers for the use of the converts, and for the purpose of supplying their own absence, and all the facts they had omitted in their public preaching. The translator objects to this hypothesis, that it is contrary to all history to suppose that the first Preachers provided themselves with a written document; and that such an one as the supposed original Gospel could never have been exclusively used. For the first Preachers must surely have taught all that was *essential*, and then it is not credible, (though Gratz thinks it even probable,) that they should wish to gratify their hearers' propensity to the marvellous, by leaving them some more miraculous stories concerning Jesus. Yet in the way in which most of the narratives are given in the supposed original document, deprived of all detail and all circumstances, they could have no other end and no other effect.

served above,) but by Bishop Marsh, and other advocates* of this hypothesis, (nay, the statement appears to us absolutely necessary to its existence,) that the chronology of this original document was defective. What possible reason can be assigned for such a deficiency in a work adopted, if not composed, by the Apostles? Why should they not give themselves the trouble to arrange the history in its due order? Was such a work beyond their abilities or below their care?

But again, supposing the existence of a document which had obtained apostolical authority, whether as a credential, or for any other imaginable purpose, is it credible that no care would be taken to preserve a single copy of it without addition, alteration, or curtailment? Would none among the preachers of the Word, the hearers, the churches, think that a less work with apostolical sanction was preferable to a greater without it, or at least was worth preservation? Would all of these persons and bodies consent to its being wholly lost and swallowed up in an ocean of *addenda*? If it was a credential, moreover, what could be a better mark of distinction between true Preachers of the Word and those unauthorized ones of whom such early complaint is made, than a genuine copy of this document?—an argument which furnishes a fresh difficulty to be overcome by those who look on it as a credential.

But if we turn to the other horn of the dilemma, and consider the work as *intended* only for private use, what is there which could gain for it such acceptance as to render it the basis of all other histories of our Lord? We cannot, if we allow the existence of such a work, doubt the existence of many others of the same kind; and then, if we examine it as far as we can collect it, by bringing together the portions common to the three Evangelists, we shall search in vain in a work unequal through its whole course, here and there copious, but on the whole miserably meagre and jejune, for anything which could give it a preference over other works of a similar nature.

These objections may be put in a simpler and shorter shape, by merely asking, who could be the writer of such a document? He must either have been an Apostle, or not. If his work was (1)

* Though we have no great respect for Kühnöl's reasoning powers, we cannot help noticing the way in which he states the hypothesis of an original document as the most probable method of accounting for the variations and coincidences of the Gospels. Not only does he, like others, admit a deficiency in chronology to exist in this document, but expressly says, that it soon underwent various changes: "*one man changing the order of the narration for this cause or that, and adding what he saw had been omitted; another omitting what he thought false or trifling.*" What reason any one could have for accepting a document at once erroneous, defective, untrue and trifling is a matter which he obviously thinks requires neither remark nor explanation.

publicly adopted, all the difficulties above alleged, arising from the errors and deficiencies of the work, apply if he were an Apostle; and if he were a private person, there is the additional marvel, that the work of a private person should be found exactly adapted for a very peculiar and momentous purpose. If, however, (2) the work was for *private* use only, is there anything in it which looks like the work of an apostle, or of an eye-witness—anything lively or full in the descriptions? On the other hand, is there anything in the jejune and concise narratives, and the suppression of all detail and circumstance, which resembles the work of one who had derived his information from eye-witnesses, and not having been so himself, would be anxious not to mislead nor deceive by the omission of anything he had heard from others. The consciousness in such a person of being unable to give accurate information himself, would be the strongest motive with him for concealing nothing he had learned.

We have neither time nor place for farther discussion of this part of the subject; but we cannot leave it without observing that we have allowed for the moment, that the hypothesis of an original document will solve all the phenomena. And no doubt where highly ingenious persons are allowed to indulge in any license of conjecture, not only to call into existence a work which may never have existed, but to suppose as many or as few forms of it as they please, one with certain *given* augmentations, another with certain other augmentations also *given*, and then as many or as few of these forms to be translated as suits their purpose, and that either by one person or by more; when, in short, they may, as often as a knot intervenes, call up a god, if they can find one, to solve it; it would be very hard if they left many to perplex their admirers or themselves. Nevertheless there are phenomena which neither Bishop Marsh nor Eichhorn have solved, although we have not any opportunity of enumerating them here. And this is an additional argument against the hypothesis; for we may be sure that if the mechanist can command power *ad libitum*, and is yet unable to overcome an obstacle, he must have gone the wrong way to work. Such seems to be the growing conviction of those who have considered the subject most attentively. One most ingenious and learned person (Gieseler) has in consequence started the notion of a sort of historical preaching on the part of the Apostles, that is to say, a frequent exhibition, in their addresses to the people, of the most remarkable passages of the life of our Lord, and of his discourses. That they should be careful to preserve the very words of their Master cannot appear strange; and many circumstances would obviously lead them to be guarded and careful in narrating the facts of his life—a feeling which would

very probably lead them to represent both constantly in almost the same form of words. And another solution of the difficulty is offered in the work before us, to which it is high time we should come.—We could, indeed, almost be tempted to smile at a review of the question for the last thirty years, which recalls that pleasing pastime of our infancy, described in Fielding's well-known lines:

“ So when the babe whom nurse from danger guards,
Sends Jack for mustard with a pack of cards,
Kings, queens, and knaves throw one another down,
Till the whole pack lies scattered and o'erthrown.
So all our pack upon the floor is cast,
And all I boast is—that I fall the last.”

Such has, indeed, been the course of things in this matter. Hypothesis has been knocked down by hypothesis till the Gospels must begin to feel themselves in a very awkward condition. If they were not written independently—and that is flatly denied;—if one was not copied from another—and that is almost given up;—if they were not derived from a single common document—and that is growing out of fashion;—if oral tradition does not account for their coincidences—and the translator assures us it cannot—at least we may flatter ourselves that they have not many farther chances of escape. The method of exhaustions has almost done its work. Professor Schleiermacher's hypothesis will, we trust, “fall the last but one;” and the last, which we think neither the Gospels nor our readers can possibly avoid, will be, that, in spite of *some* evidence from our senses, they were never written at all. This conclusion will be a most valuable adjunct to certain other great discoveries of the day, and will show in a most striking manner the march of intellect, and our incalculable superiority to our gross and ignorant forefathers.

Let us proceed then to the task of demolition, and to an introduction of our readers to Professor Schleiermacher, if they are not terrified by the name. It is a name, indeed, little known in England, but in Prussia, nay in Germany at large, regarded with that respect which is ever due to deep and accurate learning, to unwearied research, to acuteness, and to thought. Little as we agree with Professor Schleiermacher's theological views and opinions, we should feel deep shame if we could mention the name of the gifted translator of Plato without offering to it our feeble tribute of respect. The work before us has been translated into English by a gentleman whose name we are not authorized to mention, as he has judged it proper to withhold it himself, but who will, we trust, pardon us if we so far allude to him as to say, that in learning, in research, and in acuteness, Professor Schleiermacher would have found it difficult to obtain a more adequate representative. In his truly valuable Introduction he has given a

view of this interesting question of a very different nature from the mere outline we have presented. He has not only read and analysed a variety of extended and laborious works, but in giving us the fruit of his labours, has stated also his own views of the works he analyses, and his own very valuable objections to many of the arguments they contain. We are unable to assent to his reasonings on one very important subject (Inspiration), as we shall have occasion to note hereafter, and there are minor points on which we are equally at variance with him; but we feel unaffected admiration for the learning, the research, the great powers of argument, and the lucid views of the subject which this Introduction almost every where presents to us.*

We could almost fancy that Professor Schleiermacher's work arose from a passage in Eichhorn's Introduction, (ii. § 95. vol. i. p. 396,) in which he is considering the various hypotheses, besides his own, which have been offered with respect to the Gospels. He states that Le Clerc originally, and subsequently Michaelis, Priestley, Koppe and Halfeld suggested the probability that not *one* account of the whole life of Jesus, but *several* minor works or collections respecting various parts of it, had existed at a very early period, and might give the desired solution of the coincidences of the Gospels.

"But," says Eichhorn, "they rather indicated this theory, and gave a few examples, than attempted to found it on a complete application to all parts of the Gospel; so that it has not only none of the necessary definitions and limitations which such a theory requires; but it cannot be clear even to those who proposed it, whether it will explain with ease and probability the phenomena which present themselves."

Whether we are right in supposing that this passage gave rise to the work before us or not, it precisely executes what Eichhorn complains was not executed by any other person who had started the idea of a variety † (if we may so speak) of original documents.

* It is much to be wished that Mr. Horne would suppress his chapter on this subject. We are unwilling to hurt the feelings of a most respectable and valuable man; but we are constrained to say, that it is painful to see such reasonings in a book which, in this age of compilations, is, we presume, to be the principal study of the younger English Divines. There are things also relating to the evidences of our religion in Mr. Horne's book, of which we can hardly speak in more favourable terms. But here the blame rests not so much on the author, as on readers who require to be saved from the trouble of reading and thinking for themselves, and who believe that the possession of a mixed mass of *results* of reasonings quite supersedes the necessity of going over the reasonings themselves. Alas! what would our ancestors say if they saw the students for the ministry of the great and glorious Church of England looking for all their divinity to some three or four modern sketches and compilations? We fear to say more.

† We are aware that the late learned Mr. Veyrie proposed the same hypothesis; but we are informed by the translator that "he differed from Schleiermacher, both in his general view of it, (for he supposes all the narratives which compose our Gospels to have been derived immediately from the apo-stles,) and in his application of it; and that he has not entered into the details which are absolutely necessary to account for the separate existence of the documents he supposes." We say "we are informed by

The author supposes, like the critics we have named, that there were in existence at a very early period detached narratives of remarkable incidents in the life of our Lord, of his miracles and discourses. But he supposes also, (differing in this from other critics, or rather going beyond them,) that these separate narratives were collected by different individuals, as chance or inclination directed;—one might collect five or six with one object, another fewer or more with another. From these minor collections Professor Schleiermacher conceives that the works now called Gospels might be formed, and it is his especial object in the present work to prove, by a critical examination of St. Luke's Gospel, that this supposition is true in a particular case. This Gospel was, he conceives, formed by the mere juxta-position of these separate narratives, with no alteration whatever on the part of the compiler, except the addition of copulative particles, to act the part of pins or wafers in sticking the heterogeneous materials together. And it is the object of his present work, to reduce the Gospel to its original elements, pointing out both the small compilations whose embodiment composes it, and the separate narratives of which those compilations consisted. The method which he has pursued is the examination of each narrative of the whole Gospel in succession. He wishes to find whether, at the commencement of each, there is anything which indicates the opening of a *fresh* memoir or narrative, or the continuation of one already begun; and whether, at its close, there is anything which betrays a conclusion of the writer's labours, or merely a transition from one event to another. To ascertain the real connexion or artificial junction of narratives now found in juxta-position, he applies the test of probability; one event, that is to say, follows another immediately in the Gospel, and from the internal evidence which they supply, Professor Schleiermacher determines whether it is probable that one could in fact follow the other, as it appears to do. But we will leave Professor Schleiermacher to explain his own intentions, and to state the result of his labours. His work then professes to be "A Critical Examination of the Gospel of St. Luke," directed especially to observe (*Introd.* p. 17.) "in what manner, and according to what rule, or from what points of view, the several incidents are connected together, and withal, paying attention to the probable previous existence of detached narratives and collections," and thus "to endeavour to determine this

the translator;" for it is impossible to procure Mr. Veysie's work. We remember some years ago putting down our names for an edition of all the works of that learned and excellent person, which was to appear under the sanction, as we understood, of his executors and friends. Why was this design abandoned? We trust not for want of encouragement.

way, whether it is possible or not for the book to have been derived mediately or immediately, and by what species of operation, from these earlier notes?" And the result of this examination is declared to be, (p. 313,)

"that St. Luke, in this part of his work, (i. e. the Gospel,) is neither an independent writer, nor has made a compilation from works which extended over the whole life of Jesus: for we meet with too many isolated pieces, which have no relation to the rest; and the character of the several parts is too different to admit of either supposition. He is, from beginning to end, no more than a compiler and arranger of documents which he found in existence, and which he allows to pass *unaltered* through his hands."

At another place (p. 164.) Professor Schleiermacher says,

"We have now sufficient direction to judge how he really understood the task which he proposes to himself in the Introduction, *καθεξής γράψαι*, that is, *as he altered nothing in his materials, but left the more Hebraistic and the purer Greek as he found it*, and did not in general blend beginnings and conclusions; so he has observed an order of time only so far as it could be done without parting his materials."

In a word, St. Luke found sets of narratives in existence, and strung them together without alteration or endeavour to give either chronological arrangement or uniformity of style to his work, which may thus fairly be called a Rhapsody of Rhapsodies. We shall now assign our objections to this hypothesis, first of all endeavouring to show that it is in itself extremely improbable, and not, as we think, reconcilable with certain facts deducible from a study of the style and language of St. Luke's Gospel; and then, as it will doubtless be replied that Professor Schleiermacher's theory is not a mere theory, but the result (he would say the necessary result) of a *critical* examination of the work, we shall attempt to show that the principles* on which that examination is conducted (not anywhere, indeed, expressly laid down by Professor Schleiermacher, but easily deduced from his practice) are wholly inadmissible, and that consequently no dependence can be placed on the results to which they lead.

First then as to the probability of the hypothesis. That a person employed in writing an historical work should *use* such existing narratives as he could depend on, is undoubtedly both probable and rational. That he should *make up* his history of such fragmentary materials has this clear objection to it, that the writer, wanting narratives of *every* period, cannot possibly be nice in his selection, but must take such as he can find, and where he can

* This, it appears to us, is the only way in which we can do any justice to the subject. The work is one purely of detail, and to give a complete answer to it, a work of equal size would be required.

meet with none of high authority must of necessity be satisfied with others of less. That this must be the consequence of so composing an history is, we think, quite clear on mere reasonable grounds; and that it is practically true Professor Schleiermacher, at least, cannot deny, for he himself states that St. Luke has introduced incorrect, unfounded and almost fabulous narratives into his Gospel. But, we would ask, is an author to be supposed totally without perception of this obvious objection; or, in other words, is it to be supposed that he willingly produces a less valuable and authentic history where he could produce one more so? We must be allowed to think that if this is true of a common history, it is still more so of such a history as a Gospel—the history of a new religion and its founder. Whatever may be thought of the knowledge or powers of its historian, thus much all will allow, that he thought Christianity true, that is to say, he thought himself employed in giving an account of a revelation from GOD, the whole value of which depends on its being *true*. We have no wish to press this argument farther than it will bear, but it does seem to us that a person so employed would assuredly feel a deep responsibility attaching to him, and an earnest desire to obtain the very best and most authentic accounts of the weighty matters of which he was treating. And if the truth of these remarks be admitted, their force can only be evaded by saying either that St. Luke had not the power of obtaining better materials, or had no discrimination, no power of judging which were better and which worse. Now with respect to the first of these alternatives, without at all inquiring whether he was or was not himself a witness to any of our Lord's miracles, it cannot be denied with any show of argument, that he lived at the time of the transactions of which he treated, nor that he had ready access to those most capable of giving him exact and accurate accounts of all that passed in our Lord's life. We have positive evidence of his having been for a long time the companion of St. Paul, and of his having gone with him to Jerusalem, when that apostle was seized, and his long imprisonment, previous to his voyage to Rome, commenced.* At the close of that imprisonment he was at hand, and accompanied St. Paul to Rome. Where he spent the intermediate time, certainly is not positively mentioned, but from his being with St. Paul at the commencement and the close of his imprisonment, and from his having come to Jerusalem as his companion and

* We write this under the clear conviction that the writer of this Gospel and the writer of the Acts are one and the same person. We shall offer some philological reasons for this opinion below, but the external evidence of the fact is very strong; and though there are some hints in the volume before us of a theory of Professor Schleiermacher's as to the Acts, we think we have noticed other expressions which show that, in his opinion, the *authorship* of the two is the work of the same hand.

friend, we think it most probable that he was not far distant during its continuance; at all events, it is especially mentioned that at Jerusalem he went with St. Paul to St. James, when all the elders were present. It is therefore indisputable, that he had every opportunity of acquiring the best information respecting our Lord, from his Apostles and other eye-witnesses of his life and actions. What then, we would ask, could be the temptation to a person under St. Luke's circumstances, to prefer written narratives, circulating with an authenticity at least loosely established, (and, in fact, according to Professor Schleiermacher, often worthless,) to the oral testimony of the most competent witnesses; the dead words of dead writing to the living voices of living men who had been the constant attendants of our Lord, and must daily have given Luke, at least, sufficient testimony that they were led by the Spirit of God? They who adopt this hypothesis are surely bound to give some account of the motives which could induce a person situated like St. Luke, led either by inclination or a sense of duty to become the historian of the faith he had learned and accepted, and influenced by the feelings by which he and every honest Christian undertaking such a work must have been influenced, to prefer imperfect to perfect testimony, and a set of floating narratives of doubtful character to the certain evidence of eye-witnesses. Professor Schleiermacher, who cannot argue that the Evangelist would take pains to procure only authenticated narratives, (because he has stated his belief that many erroneous ones have found their way into this Gospel,) takes the other alternative to which we have alluded, and frequently says that the nicety and exactness which we, "who are a critical generation," require, were unknown to former ages, which were easily satisfied with a less rigid scrupulousness as to accuracy, and that St. Luke might, therefore, be contented with materials really imperfect. But to us this appears a poor answer to the difficulty; for there is no question here as to any research, any abstruse reasoning, any difficult inquiry. The question to be considered is simply this—whether an honest and sincere man undertaking to write the history of events of no trivial importance, but concerning the eternal welfare of mankind, and living with those who had been present and personally engaged in the most remarkable of them, would apply to these competent witnesses for information, or would deem it a wiser and a better plan to collect a set of doubtful narratives of these events, written by doubtful authors, till he had obtained some sort of account of all that interested him, and then to string his Collectanea together, (without a word of addition, of correction, or of explanation,) like Martial's Epigrams, some good, some indifferent, and more bad, into a book.

These are powerful objections to Professor Schleiermacher's theory, which, on the grounds of mere probability, will present themselves to every reader. But there are others of great force, arising from a different quarter. Professor Schleiermacher, as our readers will have observed, contends that Luke mixed together the purer and the more Hebraistic Greek, just as he found it in the materials he used. Now if such an hypothesis be correct, it would be absurd to expect any uniformity of style and phraseology in the different parts of the work—the patchwork texture would rather betray itself in every page. Yet we are disposed to believe, on the other hand, that difficult as it may be to *prove* the unity of a writer on such grounds, we can give very strong reasons, from the style of St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, for believing that they are all through the work of the same hand. Thus much, at least, we *think* we can undertake to prove, that certain very common, and other very peculiar words, either very rarely or never used by the other Evangelists, are used through various parts of the Gospel and Acts; that the same is true of certain peculiar phrases; that a large number of these peculiar words and phrases are derivable from *one* source, *viz.* the LXX: and, what is very curious, that a large number of words not used by the other writers of the New Testament, are common, as might have been expected *a priori*, to St. Luke and St. Paul. We contend then that if a peculiar phraseology runs through two works, if much of that peculiar phraseology is constantly referable to one known source, and if much of it is also to be found in the works of a person for many years the constant companion of the reputed author of these works, there is very strong reason for believing the common opinion to be the correct one. Chance can hardly have done so much—can hardly have distinguished the greater part of above forty narratives (according to Professor Schleiermacher) by the use of the same peculiar phraseology—can hardly have produced a striking connexion between their style and that of the intimate friend of their compiler.* We shall now proceed to lay before our readers some proof of these assertions, but we beg to be understood as doing it with unaffected humility and diffidence of

* The result of a pretty laborious examination of the New Testament is as follows. There are in St. Luke as many words peculiar to him as in the three other Evangelists together; (Campbell says something of this sort.) In the Acts very far more. In St. Paul as many nearly as in the rest of the New Testament. In inquiring into the words peculiar to one of the Gospels and Acts, we find more than *three* times as many in St. Luke as in either of the others. With respect to words peculiar to one of the Gospels and St. Paul, there are nearly *three* times as many in St. Luke as in St. Matthew, and more than *three* times as many as in St. Mark or St. John. Of such words there are also in the Acts about *five* times as many as in either Matthew, Mark, or John. And there are about as many words common to St. Luke, the Acts, and St. Paul, and peculiar to these books, as there are words *peculiar* to St. Luke and St. Paul alone.

our own judgment. To the learned translator of the work before us we would more especially say, that we should gladly receive from him any notice of error either in the principle of our proof, or in the instances we allege. We can hardly doubt that the same line of inquiry has been entered on by others, but the scanty supellex of a private library has only enabled us to find (as we did with great satisfaction) that three or four of our observations as to phraseology had been already made by the excellent Townson, or by Olearius (see his tract on the style of the New Testament in Rhenferd's very useful Syntagma) and a few others, as to the use of peculiar words by Eichhorn and Künöf.

Before particularizing any phrases, we would beg to recall to our readers an observation made by Townson, and well worthy of notice, that there are marks all through St. Luke of a desire to *explain* things which the other Evangelists have considered as well known, and to omit mere Jewish peculiarities, as if St. Luke's design was to address himself to persons not well acquainted with Jewish customs and history.

In order to save space we will, on this subject, only refer to Townson, Disc. iv. § 2. and Disc. vi. § 1.* Townson again has observed, as a peculiarity, that Luke does not intermix foreign words. Where Matthew (xxii. 17) and Mark (xii. 14.) say *Κῆνος*, Luke (xx. 22.) says *φόρος*. They use *ἀγγαρεύω*, he does not; *Rabbi* he never uses, but always *Ἐπιστάτης*, which the others have not. The exclamation *Hosanna*, the Hebrew words used by our Lord on the cross, the word *Golgotha* (for which he uses *Κρανίον*), are all omitted in St. Luke. The only exceptions are *Amen*, which he could hardly omit, and *Mammona* and *Gehenna*, where the substitution of the synonymous Greek words, *Πλοῦτος* and *Ταρταρος*, would have caused confusion. Again, where Matthew and Mark use the word *Μεταμορφῶω*, Luke uses a periphrasis, because that word might have caused mistake among the Gentiles.

We may mention here too an observation made, we believe, by the late Mr. Rennell, and serving to connect the third chapter of St. Luke with the first. In the first chapter John's parentage is given at length, and afterwards, in the second chapter, all mention of John is dropped, while, in clear reference to that account in the first chapter, he is called in the third the son of Zacharias, a description of him given nowhere else in Scripture. As a some-

* An instance or two will show what is meant. In xxii. 1. Luke says "The feast which is called the Passover." In xxi. 37. "The mount which is called the Mount of Olives." xxiii. 51. "Arimathea a city of the Jews." Luke too is most careful to give just notions of the state of the soul after death. See viii. 55. xvi. 9. and xix. 31. xx. 36. 38. xxiii. 40. 43. Again, he never calls the lake of Gennesareth a sea, as the others do, because it might be misunderstood, except by Jews.

what similar instance, we notice that in chap. xxiv. 10. *Joanna* is mentioned, of whom we hear nothing farther; but she has been already formally introduced and described in chap. viii. 3.

We shall now proceed to specify some more minute particulars, and we need hardly say, that we place little reliance on them *singly*, but a great deal on their joint force, to show the connexion between the several parts of St. Luke's gospel; and again, the connexion of the whole, both with the Acts and St. Paul.

First, then, we would notice a very striking peculiarity in St. Luke's method of commencing his narrations. It is by the impersonal use of Ἐγένετο with καὶ before, or δὲ after it, which is very rare in the other Evangelists.* St. Matthew has it six times only, (of which five are a phrase quite peculiar to him—Ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν,) St. John not once, while in St. Luke we find it above *forty* times, and in the Acts about *fifteen*. But there is a farther peculiarity than this in St. Luke's usage—viz. the insertion of καὶ before the principal verb, as for instance, Ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων. Of this there is a doubtful instance in St. Matthew, and another in St. Mark—none in St. John, and *twelve* in St. Luke. St. Matthew's favourite method of connexion is by a simple ἰδοὺ, or καὶ ἰδοὺ. Still farther, with respect to γίγνομαι, to express *whilst* or *as*, the phrase ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, with an infinitive of the verb expressing the action, occurs *twenty-five* times in St. Luke, (instances being found both in the first and second chapters,) but not at all in St. Matthew† nor St. John, and only twice in St. Mark.

The auxiliary ἦν with a *present* participle is found only twice in St. Matthew, (both places being common to him and St. Luke,) in St. Mark eight times, (three of them being common to him and St. Luke,) and in St. John not at all, while in St. Luke and the Acts it occurs thirty-nine times; that is to say, thirty-nine times in St. Luke and the Acts, and only five times exclusively in the other Evangelists. Some of these instances are worth noticing. Thus, we have ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες (a remarkable phrase) in the same sense in Luke iv. 20, and Acts i. 10; ἦν προσδοκῶν in Luke i. 21. viii. 4. Acts x. 24. The word προὔπαρχω again is used as an auxiliary in Luke xxiii. 12. and Acts viii. 9., but it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. We have the phrase Ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι in the three first Evangelists, besides

* It is worth remarking that καὶ ἔσται, and ἔσται δὲ, are peculiar to Acts ii. 6. 21., iii. 23., and Rom. ix. 26.

† St. Matthew has ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι, xxvii. 12. and two other instances, xiii. 4. (common to him and the two others) and 25. But ἐγένετο is not found in these passages. St. Mark has two such instances, and there are six in the Acts. Vorst, de Hebraïsmis, p. 11, c. 32, p. 164, says that St. Matthew has only one instance, xxvii. 12. and Mark only one, ii. 15. but this is wrong.

which, the future Ἔσομαι as an auxiliary, with a present participle, occurs four times in St. Luke, but not elsewhere. The reader will observe that the words and phrases marked with an asterisk *do not occur elsewhere* in the New Testament than in the passages specified.

- * The word Ἐπιχειρέω occurs Luke i. 1. Acts ix. 29. xix. 13.
- * Πληροφορέω—Luke i. 1. and four times in St. Paul.
- * Καθεξῆς—Luke i. 3. viii. 1. Three times in Acts.
- * Κατηχέω—Luke i. 4. Acts xviii. 25. xxi. 21. 24. Three times in St. Paul.
- * Κάθοτι—Luke i. 7. xix. 9. Acts ii. 24. 45. iv. 35.
- * Προβαίνειν ταῖς ἡμέραις—Luke i. 7. 18. ii. 36. This phrase occurs in the LXX. as Josh. xxiii. 1. Gen. xviii. 11. xxiv. 1.
- * Ἐπέπεσεν φόβος—Luke i. 12. Acts ix. 17.
- * Εγένετο φόβος—Luke i. 65. and three times in Acts. †

We must observe, that similar uses of ἐπιπίπτω are found in the Acts. Thus, it occurs with ἔκστασις, Acts x. 10., with ἀχλυσ, xiii. 11. The word itself occurs *ten* times in St. Luke and the Acts, and only *three* times in all the New Testament besides, one of which is in St. Paul. The phrase ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον to express *an embrace* is peculiar to Luke xv. 20. and Acts 20. 37.

- * Αγαλλίασις—Luke i. 14. 44. Acts ii. 46. Heb. i. 9.
- Πλήθω—Luke i. 15. and *twenty-one* times besides in Luke and Acts, while it only occurs *thrice* in the rest of the New Testament. But this is not all; in those three passages it is always used in its proper sense, while in St. Luke and the Acts it is perpetually used in a figurative sense. Thus, Luke vi. 11. ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας, v. 26. φόβου, iv. 28. θυμοῦ, i. 15. 41. 67. ἁγίου πνεύματος. Acts v. 17. xiii. 45. ζήλον, iii. 10. θάμβους, ii. 4. iv. 8. 31. ix. 17. xiii. 9. πνεύματος ἁγίου, which phrase, it will be observed, occurs three times in the first chapter of St. Luke, and five times in the Acts. The word πλῆθος occurs *twenty-five* times in Luke and Acts, and only *six* in all the New Testament besides.
- * Ἀιθ' ὧν (*because*)—Luke i. 20. xii. 3. xix. 24. Acts xii. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 10. Frequent in LXX.
- Προσδοκῶ—Luke i. 21. and ten times besides in Luke and Acts (two of which are speeches reported also by St. Matthew); it is only found in St. Peter besides.
- * Προσδοκία—Luke xxi. 26. Acts xii. 2. Occurs in LXX.

† We have thrown these two phrases together purposely. The reader will find below other examples of a recurrence of *nearly* similar phrases to express the same thing; and we request him also to notice another peculiarity in St. Luke, that, when a word is familiar to him, he constantly uses a variety of compounds of it, and words and phrases connected with it, such phrases and compounds being wholly or nearly peculiar to him.

- * Ἐυρίσκειν χάριν—Luke i. 30. Acts vii. 16. Heb. iv. 16. A common phrase in LXX. Ἐχειν χάριν is found only in Luke xvii. 9. and St. Paul.
- * Ὑψιστος (without an adjunct to express God)—Luke i. 32. 35. 76. vi. 35. Acts vii. 48.
- * Μεγαλειος—Luke i. 49. Acts ii. 11. Occurs both in Old Testament and in Apocrypha.
- * Ὑποστρέφω—Luke i. 56. and in *thirty-one* other places in Luke and Acts (twenty in Luke and eleven in Acts); and only three times besides in the New Testament, viz. Mark xiv. 20.—once in St. Paul, Gal. i. 17. and once in Heb. vii. 1.
- * Συγγένεια—Luke i. 61. Acts vii. 3. 14. Often in LXX. as Gen. iv. 8. Ἐνώπιον occurs *twenty-two* times in St. Luke, both in the first chapter and elsewhere, and also *fourteen* times in the Acts; *never* in St. Matthew and St. Mark; *once* in St. John's Gospel; *very many times* in St. Paul. It is found once in James and once in Peter, and in St. John's other writings, especially in Revelations. Its total omission in St. Matthew and St. Mark is curious.
- Γνώσις—Luke i. 77. ix. 52. Common in St. Paul and LXX., but not found elsewhere.
- * Γνωστός—*twelve* times in St. Luke and the Acts; once in the Romans, and once also in St. John; found also in LXX.
- * Ἀτενίζω—*twelve* times in St. Luke and the Acts; twice in St. Paul (2 Cor. iii. 7. and 13.)
- Χάρις is not found either in St. Matthew or St. Mark, and only six times in all St. John's writings; about *twenty-five* times in St. Luke and the Acts, and about 120 in St. Paul.
- * Χαριτώ—Luke i. 28. Eph. i. 6.
- Χαρίζομαι occurs six times in St. Luke; it occurs also in St. Paul, but not elsewhere.
- * Ὅδεύω—Luke x. 33. Διοδεύω—Luke viii. 1. and Acts xvii. 1.
- * Μέρις—Luke x. 42. Acts viii. 21. xvi. 12. twice in St. Paul and in LXX.
- * Μεριστής—Luke xii. 14.
- * Διαμερίζω—seven times in St. Luke and Acts; once in St. Matthew and St. Mark.
- * Διαμέρισμος—Luke xii. 51.
- * Διανεύω—Luke i. 22. Ἐννεύω—i. 62. Κατανεύω—v. 7. Ἐπινεύω—Acts xviii. 20.
- * Ἐκδικέω—Luke xviii. 3. 5. and twice in St. Paul.
- * Ἐκδίκησις—Luke xviii. 7, 8. xxi. 22. Acts vii. 24. Thrice in St. Paul, and once in Hebrews; once also in St. Peter. The phrase ποιεῖν ἐκδίκησιν occurs, Luke xviii. 7, 8. and Acts vii. 24.
- * Παρατηρέω—Luke vi. 7. xiv. 1. xx. 20. Acts ix. 24. Gal. iv. 10. and once in St. Mark, in a place common to St. Luke (vi. 7.) and him.
- * Παρατήρησις—Luke xvii. 20.

- * Ἀφαιρεῖν τὴν φωνήν—Luke xvii. 13. Acts iv. 24.
- * Ἐπαίρειν τὴν φωνήν—Luke xi. 27. and thrice in Acts. Occurs in LXX.
- * Ἐπιβιβάζω—Luke x. 34. xix. 35. Acts xxiii. 24.
- * Συμβιβάζω—twice in Acts; four times in St. Paul.
- Ἐυαγγελίζομαι—ten times in St. Luke; fifteen times in Acts; twenty-two times in St. Paul; never in St. Mark, or St. John; and only once in St. Matthew, and that in a quotation common to St. Luke and him.
- * Ἐυλαβῆς—Luke ii. 5. Acts ii. 15. viii. 22.
- * Σπένδω—Luke ii. 16. xix. 5, 6. Acts xx. 16. xxii. 18. and often in LXX.—but not elsewhere in New Testament, except once, in a different sense, in St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 12.)
- * Κατὰ πρόσωπον—Luke ii. 31. Acts iii. 13. xxv. 16. and thrice in St. Paul.
- * Ὑποδείκνυμι—three times in St. Luke; twice in Acts; one place in St. Luke (iii. 27.) is common to him and Matt. iii. 7.
- * Κατὰ τὸ εἶωθός (with a dative of the person)—Luke iv. 16. Acts xvii. 2. The participle does not occur elsewhere. Κατὰ τὸ ἔθος occurs thrice in St. Luke, and not elsewhere. Ἐθος itself occurs ten times in St. Luke and the Acts, once in the Hebrews; once in St. John, but not elsewhere.
- * Πείθω occurs *twenty-one* times in St. Luke and the Acts; twenty-nine in St. Paul; and only six times in the rest of the New Testament.
- Ἐπιλαμβάνομαι occurs twelve times in St. Luke and the Acts; and is found in St. Paul and the Hebrews,—once in Matthew and once in Mark.
- * Ἀντιλαμβάνομαι—Luke i. 55. Acts xx. 35. 1 Tim. vi. 2.
- * Συναντιλαμβάνω—Luke x. 40. Rom. viii. 26.
- * Ἀνταποκρίνομαι—Luke xiv. 6. Rom. iv. 12. Often in LXX.
- * Ἀνταποδίδωμι—Luke xiv. 14. Often in Paul and in LXX.
- * Διαμαρτύρομαι—seven times in St. Luke and Acts, and three or four in St. Paul; occurs also in LXX.
- * Ἐξουθενέω—Luke xviii. 9. xxiii. 11. Acts iv. 11.; and seven times in St. Paul.
- * Συνευδοκέω—Luke xi. 48. Acts viii. 1. Thrice in St. Paul.
- * Ἀπολογέω—eight times in St. Luke and Acts; twice in St. Paul.
- * Συναρπάζω—Luke viii. 29. and three times in Acts; also in LXX.
- * Ἀνακρίνω—Luke xxiii. 14; five times in Acts; ten times in St. Paul.
- * Ἐφίστημι—eighteen times in St. Luke and Acts; thrice in Paul.
- * Μεθίστημι—Luke xvi. 4. Acts xiii. 22. xix. 26. 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Col. i. 13.
- * Διαπορέω—Luke ix. 7. xxiv. 4.; thrice in Acts, and in LXX.
- * Συναντάω—Luke ix. 37. xxii. 10. Acts x. 25. xx. 12. Heb. vii. 1. 10; and in LXX.
- * Ἀναλύω (to return)—Luke xii. 36. It occurs in LXX.; and in Phil. i. 23. in the sense of *dying*.

- * Καταλύω (of going to an *inn* or *place of refreshment*)—Luke ix. 12. xix. 7. It occurs in LXX.
 - * Προσφωνέω—six times in Luke and Acts; and once in St. Matthew, in a place common to him and St. Luke.
 - * Ἐπέχω—Luke xiv. 7. Acts iii. 5. xix. 22. Phil. ii. 16. 1 Tim. iv. 16.
 - * Ἡ ἐχομένη (for *the next day*)—Luke xiii. 33. Acts xx. 15. and (with *ἡμέρα*) xxi. 26. Ἐχω is not used of proximity in time elsewhere in the New Testament, except perhaps in Acts xiii. 44., but it is so used in LXX.
 - * Ἡ ἐξῆς (the next day)—twice in St. Luke; thrice in Acts.
 - * Ἀξίον θανάτου—Luke xxiii. 15., and four times in Acts.
 - * Ἐργασία—Luke xii. 58. Four times in Acts; and once in St. Paul.
 - * Βουνός—Luke iii. 5. xxiii. 30.
 - * Θάμβος—Luke iv. 36. v. 9. Acts iii. 10.
 - * Οχλείσθαι ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου—Luke vi. 18. and Acts v. 16. The word is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.
 - * Δοχὴ—Luke, v. 29. xiv. 13. and in LXX.
 - * Κλίνω (of the day)—Luke ix. 12. xxiv. 29.
 - * Ἐυθετος εἰς—Luke ix. 62. xiv. 35; and in Heb. vi. 7. with a dative. Occurs in LXX.
 - * Πράσσω (to exact)—Luke iii. 13. xix. 23.
 - * Ἔσσις—Luke xiii. 32. Acts iv. 22. and 30. (of miraculous cures) and in LXX.
 - * Ἐι μή τι—Luke ix. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Cor. xiii. 5.
 - Ἐπάρχω occurs in St. Luke and the Acts above thirty times, and in St. Paul about ten; and only four times besides in the New Testament, except that the participle τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, for *one's property*, (which occurs nine or ten times in St. Luke and the Acts, once in St. Paul, and once in the Hebrews,) is found thrice in St. Matthew, of which one is a place common to him and St. Luke.
 - * Ζωογονέω—Luke xvii. 33. Acts vii. 19. 1 Tim. vi. 13.
 - * Ἐπιπιάζω—Luke xviii. 5. 1 Cor. ix. 27.
 - * Ἀναρέω—Luke xxii. 2. xxiii. 32.; about *twenty* times in the Acts; once in Hebrews, and once in St. Matthew.
 - * Ζηλωτής—the name given to Simon in Luke vi. 15. Occurs also Acts i. 13., and not elsewhere.
 - * Ἡ κλάσις τῶ ἄρτου—Luke xxiv. 35. Acts ii. 42. Compare Acts ii. 46. xx. 7. 11. and 1 Cor. x. 16.
- Compare also *οὐκὸνομος τῆς ἀδικίας* in Luke xvi. 8. with *κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας* in xviii. 6; and, again, *ἀνένδεκτον*, Luke xvii. 1. with *ἐνδέχεται* in xiii. 33. both *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in the New Testament.
- Τὸ τί, &c.—The union of the article with the interrogative, as τὸ τί ἂν ποιήσωσιν, is only found in Luke i. 62. ix. 46. xix. 48. xxii. 23, 24. Acts xxii. 30. Rom. viii. 26. We find it with *πως* and a sentence in Luke xxii. 2. 4., and we think it is only joined with a sentence once in St. Matthew (xix. 18) and once in Mark ix. 23.

We may add to these collections, that so persuaded is Griesbach* that an unity of style pervades St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, that he delivers it as his opinion that the two first chapters are the work of St. Luke, because they resemble the rest of the Gospel and the Acts in so many points. He says expressly, that these two chapters are not, on close examination, more Hebraistic than the rest of the Gospel; and he gives the following specific remarks:

“The phrase Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, i. 5, occurs also vi. 12; Acts, viii. 1. ix. 37. The Hebrew Ἐγένετο is very usual in St. Luke, as iii. 21. v. 1. xii. 17. xvi. 22, &c.; Acts, ix. 32. xxviii. 17. So is ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, as vii. 26. 28; Acts, vi. 1. xi. 27.”

To the instances we have alleged, we could add many more, and we do not pretend to have paid one half of the attention to the subject which its importance deserves. Still, many of the instances we have produced are very striking, and appear to prove, as far as such proofs avail, at least that the writer of St. Luke's Gospel, even if he used written documents, must have altered them very considerably, and re-written many of them in his own style. And if this be admitted, it not only modifies Professor Schleiermacher's hypothesis, but destroys the view of it peculiar to him; it proves, we mean, that the compiler was not *merely* a compiler, and did not string together the narratives he found, like beads, mixing little and great, red, blue and yellow in one tasteless and ill-assorted row.

We have thus stated our objections to Professor Schleiermacher's theory. Still, if this theory is founded, as he contends, on a critical examination of the Gospel, it is not enough to show that there are these objections to it, or to point out their strength. It will now, therefore, be our business to show that the *principles* on which that examination is conducted cannot lead us to truth. And we can safely aver that, after perusal and re-perusal of the work, and with minds perfectly alive to the ingenuity and talent exhibited in it, we have felt a growing conviction of the falsehood of the principles which that ingenuity is employed to adorn. We are persuaded indeed, that, with the license of conjecture which Professor Schleiermacher allows himself, there are no conclusions whatever which we could not establish with respect to St. Luke's Gospel, or to any other book in the world.

Our objections are as follows. First, we think that Professor Schleiermacher assumes, in an unwarrantable manner, the right of supplying from his own fancy all the circumstances and details of every narration which he finds in the Gospel, and that he then

* This opinion is given in a work hardly known in this country, the second part of his *Commentarius Criticus in textum Græcum N. T.* Jena. 1811. See p. 57.

explains the whole transaction by means of the very details he has supplied; next, we object to him that he gratuitously assumes the existence of the most incredible stupidity and ignorance on the part of the sacred writers, whenever he can get rid of any difficulty by such an hypothesis; thirdly, we maintain that nothing can be more improbable in themselves than the details he supplies, and that they are evidently imagined to support particular positions and prove particular points; and lastly, that these details are not only improbable in themselves, but that they do great injustice to the character of Jesus, considered not as a Divine Being, but a heavenly teacher, and are quite inappropriate to such a character. First of all, then, we allege, that in applying the test of probabilities, Professor Schleiermacher assumes to himself an unlimited license in filling up the details of the narratives. To make our objection intelligible, we will first give an example of his method of canvassing probabilities. In commenting on the fifth chapter of the Gospel (p. 81) he tells us, that the narrative (ver. 27—39) of the calling of Matthew, and our Lord's discourse with the Scribes and Pharisees, was not written in connexion with the narrative (ver. 17—26) of the cure of the paralytic, which also contains a conversation of the same parties, for the following reasons. According to Professor Schleiermacher, "the conversation of Christ and the Pharisees is evidently the main point of the second narrative." That is, the call of St. Matthew is not so. That is only mentioned because the conversation would not have been intelligible without the fact that Christ and his disciples had partaken of a repast at the publican's house.

"But the doctors of the law would scarcely have staid without till the *splendid* repast was at an end, for they were sure enough of finding Christ and his disciples at the usual time of public business the next day, and this conversation could scarcely follow immediately after the *banquet*. Had this history therefore been related in a continuous thread with the former, we should have found them connected either in this manner, *Still they were minded, after this, again to question his disciples, for that the day before he had sat at meat with them at the house of a publican, with many other publicans and sinners: or thus, And he went hence to a great feast which a publican had made for him, and from this the Scribes and Pharisees took occasion afresh, &c.* Ours, however, sounds quite like an independent narrative which premises the circumstances necessary to be known without concerning itself about any further connexion. The phrase *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα* is much too vague to seek in it a view to any precise reference to the preceding passage."

From this specimen our readers will see somewhat of the nature of Professor Schleiermacher's proceedings. He supposes that we are able to judge accurately of the writer's aim in a particular narrative; that we know enough of the circumstances of

the event he relates, to judge whether it is probable that the doctors of the law would wait for Christ till he had finished a visit to a given person *presumed* to be objectionable to them; that we can decide whether these habits were so strongly rooted, that even the unusual excitement of a teacher come to oppose their law, would not induce them to any change, but would compel them to wait till the usual hours of business for an interview with him; whether in a small place they could not have met with him instantly on his leaving the house, without derogating from their dignity; and again, that we can pronounce with some certainty as to the method by which the writer would connect the preceding and succeeding parts of his narrative.

We are not about now to make any remarks on this peculiar passage, but have cited it, as we before said, to put our readers in possession of the style of canvassing probabilities, to which Professor Schleiermacher has recourse in every page, because we think there are the most decided objections to it. The fullest details which we have of any parts of our Lord's life, except perhaps its closing scenes, are yet so scanty, and give such a wide field for the exercise of imagination, that every sober-minded man would, on that account, feel it necessary to put limits to his discursive faculty. He would be thought mad who professed that from the outline of a picture by a great master he could fill it up with its original colouring, although long study of many of that master's works might enable him to judge of the tendency of his taste, and the combinations of his colouring. But where we have certain bare facts stated to us as having occurred nearly two thousand years ago, in a state of society as remote in every way as it is possible from our own, it really appears to us idle to say we can tell exactly what led to those facts. Human nature, doubtless, is always the same, and we may say that in all climates and all ages the love of good and the love of evil are nearly the same, that gain will ever lure the base, and honour and courage gain the admiration of the brave, but to say, as we perpetually find Professor Schleiermacher does, (referring to Mark, ii. 13,) that it is not likely that Christ would teach near a Custom-house, because, as he assumes, there must have been a great deal of business constantly going on, that it is not likely (p. 82.) that he would go out of a town where we know he had often taught in public buildings and private houses, to teach by the sea-shore, with a thousand other things of the same sort,* does appear to us

* Professor Schleiermacher is here and elsewhere (p. 86.) unreasonably severe on St. Mark, who, besides narrating the call as St. Matthew and St. Luke do, gives one additional circumstance, viz. that after the cure of the paralytic, Christ had gone down to the sea-shore, and that there finding Matthew employed at the receipt of Custom, he

perfectly unreasonable. Yet on such reasonings and probabilities as these is a large portion of Professor Schleiermacher's book founded.

Thus (p. 105), since Christ came on one day to Capernaum, it is not probable (says Professor Schleiermacher) that he should leave it for Jerusalem the next, because as it was the residence of himself and several of his disciples, *they must have had a variety of affairs to transact.*

“The easiest way of conceiving” the circumstances of the sermon on the Mount is, (p. 87,) “that it occurred on the return from a festival-journey when Christ was surrounded by a double crowd; on the one hand by *the caravan with which he had travelled*, which had, of course, been joined by several parties on the road, and which, to crown the occasional conversations by the way, now that he was on the point of returning to his place of abode, he wished to dismiss with a more explicit parting address. This numerous company had, perhaps, *filled the inns, so as to render them too noisy for Jesus*, who may have preferred, in the fine season of the year and in a well-known spot, to spend the last night in the open air, and accordingly have ascended the Mount. His arrival, however, became known wherever the company passed the night, and *if any travellers, who were pressed for time*, went on late in the evening into Capernaum, there also, and hence a second crowd, &c.

The whole of this is founded, as far as we see, on what Professor Schleiermacher calls “*Matthew's hint*, that *Jesus only* entered into Capernaum after the discourse, and had, *therefore*,

gave him a call to follow him. Schleiermacher says, that St. Mark “cannot forbear attaching the incident to something,” and that as the Custom-house was near the lake, he “makes Christ go out thither and teach.” This, he contends, is quite improbable, because, as we have stated above, he might have taught in the town, and because the vicinity of a *great* Custom-house was not a suitable place for teaching. Now, we would ask, whether because a person *could* teach in a town, there is any thing whatever improbable that circumstances may have induced him to teach without it? that person, moreover, being in the constant habit of teaching out of doors. And with respect to the Custom-house, why does he say it was a *great* one, and that pursuits of a different nature were *perpetually* carrying on there? Really a German, of all persons, need not think it wonderful that there should be a toll-house and toll-keeper with very little employment, if any such supposition is necessary; for why should not a public teacher, on the other hand, go to a place where there was a great collection of persons, if that was really the case? We are at a loss to know what Professor Schleiermacher means by saying that St. Matthew's narrative of his own *call* is *less immediate* (p. 83); for although some writers have thought that Matthew and Levi were not the same person, we have not seen any who deny that in St. Matthew's narrative is handed down the history of his own conversion. Eichhorn does not think that there is any difference of persons, nor does he agree in the common solution that Matthew had two names, but solves the difficulty by supposing that the original document had by some mistake put in the name of Levi; that Matthew tacitly corrected the error, while the other two were misled by it. Granting the existence of the original document, how arbitrary is this assumption of an error on such a subject! how wild the supposition that Mark and Luke did not know the names of the Apostles! When we find Simon, Thomas, Lebbaeus, and Simon the Canaanite, distinguished by other names, that hypothesis seems to us free from difficulty.

probably not come out of the town, but from another quarter." This *hint* is simply a statement (Matt. viii. 5) that "when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came to him a Centurion;" as if that expression was in any degree exclusive; and as if it was not used a thousand times in the Gospels, when clearly designating Jesus and his disciples. Perhaps, however, the *vis* of Professor Schleiermacher's proof is this: that as the crowd had probably come *from* Capernaum, their return to their usual abode did not appear to require notice; while the mention of Jesus going into Capernaum looks as if he had not lately been there. (See pages 96, 97.) But this is really drawing threads very far too fine.

In p. 97, Professor Schleiermacher says, that Luke's narrative of the cure of the Centurion's servant is preferable to Matthew's. The differences are, principally, that in Luke the servant is dying; "in Matthew only labouring under a *severe nervous disorder*;" and that in Matthew the Centurion comes himself, in Luke he sends messengers. To show that Matthew is less to be depended on, Professor Schleiermacher says that in the palsy, in whatever degree the servant may have been *δενωος βασανιζόμενος*, there was no danger in delay; and that as Christ was just returning at all events from a fatiguing discourse, such urgent haste can hardly be explained. And, therefore, if the man had laboured only under palsy or an arthritic disease, the *modest Centurion, above all men, would have waited till Jesus had reached home and was at leisure*. Now, without discussing here the differences between the narratives, we must say, that this appears to us singularly trifling. What *modesty* is there in urging a troublesome and improper request by another instead of by yourself? What inconsistency is there between the two accounts; one saying, that a person is at the point of death, —the other, that he has a dreadful and tormenting attack of palsy? Did no man ever die in an attack of that "severe nervous disorder?"

Again, (p. 233,) the children must have been presented *in a throng*, or the disciples would not have interfered to prevent it. Christ must have been at the place some time; for unless there had been *a considerable intimacy*, the people would not have entertained such a thought. And the reason of their presenting their children was, that *they did not hope to see him again*, and wished to procure for their children some lively and symbolical memorial of him.

The indulgence of the imagination, as to these little household details, is quite characteristic of Professor Schleiermacher's nation; and to German works of fiction they give in our eyes, we are free to confess in spite of the general opinion, a great and peculiar charm. But in a history, where the only thing which can

give any value to full details would be their *exact truth*, the giving such details where there is, to say the least, as much chance that they are wholly false, appears to us quite out of place. It might, perhaps, be not improperly employed, if used to account for apparent variations between historians of the same facts; but our objection is increased, if instead of such an application, it is often used for the purpose of showing how the *assumed* inaccuracies of statements *wholly uncontradicted* arose, and even to account for what Professor Schleiermacher chooses to consider the errors of one historian when positively confirmed by another.

We must next state the strong feelings of surprise with which we find Professor Schleiermacher recurring so often, when pressed by any difficulty, to the supposition of a monstrous stupidity on part of the Evangelists, and a total inability on their part to apprehend things perfectly clear and easy to us. We are very far from expecting that a writer holding the opinions of Professor Schleiermacher should treat the works of the Evangelists with more respect than he would any other ancient historical documents, but it is not unreasonable to expect him not to treat them with less. Allowing as much as Professor Schleiermacher pleases for our superiority as a critical generation, is there any reason for supposing that the Evangelists had not common sense, and did not know the commonest facts, when those facts are as clear to us, at this distance of time, as the noon-day? Yet there is ample proof that Professor Schleiermacher entertains such an opinion. For example, he states it (p. 92) as his belief, that there was no solemn calling of the Apostles, and that St. Luke did not mean to state any such calling. But he allows that St. Mark does, in the most decided manner. And how does he reconcile this with his denial of the fact? Simply by supposing that St. Mark saw this passage in St. Luke, and misunderstood it! There are two monstrous improbabilities to be got over in this statement; for we would ask, first, whether it is credible that St. Mark did not know whether there was a solemn calling of the Apostles or not? and, secondly, what possible reason there is for supposing that he was more likely to misunderstand St. Luke than ourselves?

In treating of the Temptation, Professor Schleiermacher thinks that the most natural explanation of it is, that it is a parable delivered by Christ to his disciples, which

“might, however, (p. 59,) at the second or third hand,” (i. e. in the case of St. Luke and St. Matthew,) “easily have been understood historically, and yet as easily, *notwithstanding this misconstruction*, pass unaltered through a great number of hands.”

We are not about to combat this explanation of the Tempta-

tion, (though fraught with the greatest possible difficulties,) but wish simply to ask, what reason there is for supposing that persons under the circumstances of St. Luke and St. Matthew could not distinguish between a parable and a history, and that their blunder was never discovered, nay, was propagated by St. Mark also?

Again, (pp. 67, 68,) Professor Schleiermacher says, that St. Luke's reason for inserting the account of the tumult at Nazareth, in the particular place which it holds, was,

“*undoubtedly*, as has been already remarked by others, that he took this incident for the motive which induced Jesus to fix his residence at Capernaum, and not at Nazareth, evidently *without good ground*. For this narrative presupposes a stay of considerable length at Capernaum, and not one of a few days only, and also a long absence from Nazareth. This must be felt by every one who gives himself up without a bias to the impression of the narrative, though Luke is *excusable* for not having felt it, because he was *seeking a motive* for the choice of residence, and *deserves praise* for so doing; so that upon the whole *the very mistake* speaks more in his favour than against him.”

Professor Schleiermacher allows, subsequently, that “it is also *conceivable that this may not have escaped*” Luke, a conclusion to which we heartily assent, as we cannot but think a double injustice is done him by these remarks. In the first place, what Professor Schleiermacher considers as an error, is fixed on him on the most inconclusive evidence, or rather on no evidence whatever—for out of the thousand motives which may induce a writer to tell a particular fact in a particular place, it is too much to assume that we have discovered the true one. And next he is convicted on this no-evidence of stupidity beyond conception; for, as Professor Schleiermacher says, the narrative undoubtedly does show a return to Nazareth after a *long absence*; and yet he would have us believe that St. Luke either did not understand this, or was blind to the fact that the statements in his narrative were fatal to his own object, in giving that narrative at a particular part of his history. Surely even they who do not believe the Apostles to have been assisted by a superior power in the composition of their histories, have yet no ground for making them utterly deficient in common sense. And surely there must be something singularly unsound in conclusions which can only be attained by such desperate measures as these. It is, in good truth, extraordinary to observe how regularly and systematically Professor Schleiermacher cuts the knot of every difficulty, by “mistake on part of the reporter in Matthew, or Mark, or Luke,” as the occasion requires. If there is the most trifling variation between the accounts of the Evangelists, instead of inquiring

whether there is not some easy way of reconciling the two, he always settles that they positively disagree, and that therefore the information of one of them was bad. Another favourite supposition is, that either the reporters or Evangelists frequently misunderstood the meaning of what Christ said, and thus gave wrong views of matter which had fallen from him, or connected it with facts or events with which he never meant it to be connected. Such expressions as these are quite common—"Matthew either had a *less authentic reporter*, or, *perhaps, only obscured* the state of the case by his habit of annexing analogous matter."—p. 159. One instance is almost ludicrous. St. Matthew mentions that when our Lord entered into Jerusalem, he sent for *an ass and a colt*. The others (who, observe, were *not eye-witnesses*) mention only the colt on which our Lord actually rode. Nothing, we apprehend, can be clearer than this matter. St. Matthew tells us *all* that happened, because he saw *all*; the others received their report second-hand, and mentioned only the material fact, that Jesus entered riding on a colt, which he had sent for, and which had been given him in an extraordinary manner. But what says Professor Schleiermacher? He

"can only explain this by the attempt (on the part of St. Matthew) to make the application of the fact to the passage in Zacharias as close as possible. *Every other explanation appears to be lost labour*; for if Matthew is to be reconciled with the rest, it must have been properly the *πῶλος* which Christ bespoke for himself; but when the *πῶλος* is able to bear the weight of a man, though it has never yet been ridden, the she-ass no longer runs at its side, but has long left it to itself."

If such things were worth arguing about, one might say that Professor Schleiermacher has entirely forgotten that the animals were together upon compulsion, being tied up;—but can he really mean to argue gravely, that no foal in the world ever ran by its mother's side beyond a given time?

But we must return to Professor Schleiermacher's system of conjectures, for the purpose of observing, thirdly, that not only does he allow himself, as we have remarked, the most extraordinary license in conjuring up feelings, intentions, motives, and circumstances, but that in many instances these conjectures are as unhappy, and the motives and circumstances conjectured as forced and as improbable, as it is possible to imagine. His wish is often father to his thoughts. He forms a theory as to the way in which a particular occurrence took place, and then imagines circumstances to suit it. We will give an example or two. He wishes to get rid of the bodily descent of the spirit, and therefore chooses to consider that the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke

are only representations* of “the sensible image impressed on the minds of the hearers” (p. 62.) when a certain original narrative was repeated to them “in detached parts, and not always quite alike.” This notion of there being one original narrative only, arises obviously from the wish to prevent any farther confirmation of the obnoxious fact, on the ground of its coming from *several* sources. And how is the fact proved? By an assertion that John *only* was present at our Lord’s baptism, and related the circumstances to his disciple John the Evangelist. The heavenly sign, argues Professor Schleiermacher,

“cannot have been given in presence of a *great multitude*, for traces of the strong impression of such an event are altogether wanting.† Christ must have been (already) baptized when the envoys of the great council came, as is clear from the thread of St. John’s Gospel.—Then John the Baptist could not have described the Messiah as wholly unknown, if he had been proclaimed in *so public a manner*; nor could he the next day have spoken to his disciples of this sign *evidently* as of something that had occurred to himself.”

Now we have no doubt that the time of the baptism is correctly determined, but we wish to ask *why* it must have been in the presence of a great multitude, or of John alone; and whether, in coming to such a conclusion, we do not wilfully reject the only probable supposition, namely, that as John was obviously baptizing for a long time, and persons probably came to him for baptism daily, Christ came when *others*, though *not a crowd*, were present. They who were so would not remain with John, and therefore in speaking of it he would mention it of course as what *he* had seen, without at all implying that he was alone. Besides, it is a mere assumption on Professor Schleiermacher’s part that John speaks of Christ as *wholly unknown*; he only speaks of him to the Priests and Levites just come from Jerusalem, as unknown to *them*, which of course was the case.

Page 131, 132. Professor Schleiermacher observes, that Luke (viii. 22.) does not tell us the object of our Lord and his disciples in going on the sea; and he wishes to show that they went out without any particular object, and not with the intention of making a journey.

“The easiest way of conceiving the whole occurrence is to imagine that the disciples had gone out in the boat to *fish*, and that Jesus accompanied them; for why should he *always* have let the time so spent be

* The difficulty of getting over St. John’s words he quite overlooks.

† We do not stop the course of Professor Schleiermacher’s argument to notice the weakness of its several parts, but we must say that these very loose and inconclusive reasonings occur too often. They would prove little against the most regular and artificial history, and nothing against the Gospels.

lost for their instruction and the exertion of his whole influence on them?" &c.

He appears to have forgotten that St. Matthew mentions a circumstance rather adverse to Jesus being employed in teaching his disciples on this occasion—namely, that *he was asleep*.—Matt. viii. 24.

In the next page he appears to us to go beyond mere forced conjectures; and, at least, we cannot fail to remark here a singular looseness and inaccuracy. Professor Schleiermacher thinks that the disciples went out to fish, and that the intention of going to the other side was unpremeditated; and from this he deduces an argument that the incidents in St. Matthew (viii. 19—22.) are out of their place.

“For if Jesus had so pressing exhortations several persons who were not of the number of his ordinary companions to undertake the journey with him, he would have been less likely to have abandoned his place,” &c.

Now what is the real case? A scribe *offers* to follow him, and Jesus, instead of exhorting him to do so, *discourages* him. To a second, called “another of his disciples,” who requested permission to go and bury his father, he says, indeed, *Follow me*; but it is as a *reply* to the request, not a *solicitation* originating with Jesus. “Let the dead bury the dead, but do you, who are a follower of mine, turn away from these connexions with the world.” Where are the *pressing exhortations to several persons* to undertake this journey with him?

But last and most of all, we distinctly and strongly make our objections to the spirit in which many of the conjectured circumstances are conceived, as degrading, if not to our Lord himself, at least to his station as a heavenly teacher, and exhibiting the most unworthy views of his errand among men. It may not be very easy to say what would be the exact line of conduct pursued by such a teacher, or how *far* he might enter into the common detail of life; but surely nothing can be less reasonable than to reduce every action and every movement to the ordinary level of ordinary life, and to contend that every thing which cannot be so reduced is improbable. But this is the level to which Professor Schleiermacher seeks to reduce all the transactions of the life of Jesus; this is the test by which he tries them; and these are the grounds on which he passes sentence of improbability on so many of them. Now let any man look at the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and believing (if after such examination he can) that its author was a mere man, yet under that belief let him say whether, in a system so opposed to the spirit of the time in which it was propagated, so abstract from the world, so pure, so holy, so simple it may be, and

yet so sublime, he does not find ample reason for concluding that its author must on very many occasions have entirely avoided and renounced all the common routine of life, and dedicated himself to thought, retirement, and prayer. Jesus, we are told, passed the night on the Mount in prayer. Is there anything in any way improbable in this, if he were a mere man, believing himself sent by God to instruct and reform mankind? It is mockery to put the question if he were really a heavenly teacher. Yet Professor Schleiermacher chooses to account for this by supposing (without a trace of it in the history) that he must have been at a festival; that he was returning to his abode with a caravan, and from the bustle of the inn, which he disliked, was driven out to pass the night in the air! All this, it seems, is easier than the simple fact, that he, who was, or at all events believed himself to be, a heavenly teacher, desired to strengthen himself for his office by solitude and prayer! It is very much in the same spirit that Professor Schleiermacher explains our Lord's mission of the Seventy to preach the advent of the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. He says (p. 203.) that on his journey "Jesus had sent messengers before him to announce his coming, and *invite his friends to join him.*" St. Luke tells us that they returned with joy at their own success; but Professor Schleiermacher informs us, that "their little success was obvious to every one." We have no idea what design Professor Schleiermacher conceives our Lord could have had in *inviting his friends to join him*, for his uniform practice was to avoid any unnecessary publicity, desiring probably, among other reasons, that his doctrines and miracles should work their own way, and that nothing should be attributed by his enemies to the effects of popular clamour and ferment. But again, it would seem that Professor Schleiermacher really imagines that neither the preaching nor the miracles of Christ produced any sensation, nor caused him to be regarded with any wonder; for (p. 119.) he contends that the woman who "anointed our Lord to his burying" would have been repulsed from the entertainment, and "forced to retire in a mortifying manner, or would have appeared perfectly extravagant and ridiculous, unless, on the one hand, she had a right to be there, and near the company; and, on the other, been known before hand to stand on terms of intimacy with Christ." So that it is obvious that Professor Schleiermacher would expect, if a heavenly teacher were to appear, promising forgiveness of sins, and proving his own right to accord it by the performance of miracles, that all the ordinary etiquette and decorum of society should be kept up, and that no one but those admitted to his intimate acquaintance should show their acceptance of the boon he offered, and their reverential sub-

mission to his authority and confidence in his power, by any powerful or genuine marks of feeling. In the same spirit Professor Schleiermacher perpetually speaks of the resort of the multitude to Jesus as something very improbable. (See pp. 71. 74.) This does appear to us marvellous poor philosophy—unlike the observations of one so capable as Professor Schleiermacher is of appreciating the strength of human nature as well as its weakness, or believing that it has any strength or depth of feeling—that it is susceptible of the higher emotions, or ever able to burst the trammels of every-day usage at the call of a higher power from without or within. This philosophy mistakes, as Wordsworth has said of certain politicians, a promptness in looking at the superficial character of men for higher knowledge; it has seen the outside, and cannot persuade itself that there is aught beneath; it knows how things go on to day, and it is therefore certain that they always did and always will go on in the same manner.

In what precedes we have noticed the way in which Professor Schleiermacher uses his theory of probabilities to explain the rise and progress of St. Luke's Gospel. But he has recourse occasionally to the aid of critical views and considerations of the *words* of the narrative. These, however, are not in general of sufficient consequence to make remark necessary. But there is one exception to this observation, which occurs very early in the work, and on which the author lays great stress. In commenting on the two first chapters, he lays it down as

“a principle, which every one, with the liberty of course of allowing exceptions from it grounded on peculiar circumstances, will readily admit, that a continuous narrative never goes back from the particular to the general, unless it totally drops the subject. On the other hand, a particular incident related by itself presents no satisfactory conclusion, except where the form of the composition rigidly excludes every addition. This every one feels, and adds some general clause.”

And hence Professor Schleiermacher goes on to argue, that where the same subject is continued, and one particular incident follows another, such a return to the general clause is quite out of place, and can never occur to a narrator of common sense. This position he uses to detach many narratives in St. Luke's Gospel from those which immediately follow them; but it is far, very far, too sweeping. The general truth of the observation we of course admit; but if it is to be made *a test* for trying a doubtful point, it must be made, not *general*, but *universal*. Now we should be extremely sorry to assert it *universally* of the most regular and artificial historians, of whose habits we have all the information which a long work can give, when we consider the influence of particular circumstances and particular moods of mind; still more

reluctant should we be, when we consider the variety of constitutions of the human mind, so to assert it of those who have left little behind them, but of whom it is clear that they were anything but regular or artificial writers; and our reluctance would rise still higher if we were called to assert universally of all writers a principle built on the practice of those of particular schools or countries. Let any man, for example, compare the wide differences between oriental and European writers, and consider the rashness of such a proceeding. But even if these points were all settled to our satisfaction, how many *circumstances* are there which might lead to a deviation from even a well established rule. A quotation, for example, from some well-known writer, or of some well-known phrase or sentiment, although a *general* one, could hardly be reckoned a deviation. Now in one of Professor Schleiermacher's two first exemplifications of his canon, we are prepared to show that this is the case. In Luke, ii. 52, we read that "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour both with God and man;" and hence Professor Schleiermacher argues that this is the end of a certain detached narrative.* It appears, however, that the last words are a quotation from 1 Sam. ii. 26. We know how familiar the writer (or, if Professor Schleiermacher please, the writers) of St. Luke are with the LXX. or rather with the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and we know how familiar also the Jews at large were with them, having no other literature, and this having a religious as well as literary value. The use, therefore, of a phrase probably quite familiar to them, (and what part of the Jewish history could be more interesting than that of Samuel,) can hardly be adduced as an exemplification of the principle here laid down, by an unprejudiced mind. But besides this, we conceive that all the instances which Professor Schleiermacher adduces are objectionable on other grounds. Let any one compare ch. i. 80.† and ch. ii. 20. 52. with what immediately follows them, and see whether there is not quite change enough of subject in each case to justify the degree of generality found in these remarks; and at verse 40 (ch. ii.) it really appears to us that it

* Nothing can be more arbitrary than Professor Schleiermacher's use of his own principle. He makes ch. i. 5—80. a single narrative, when, if that principle is true, no one would hesitate to fix a conclusion at i. 66, (more especially comparing it with ii. 51,) which seems to be also a quotation from 1 Sam. iii. 19. The words are not very remarkable, perhaps, either in ii. 52. (where Professor Schleiermacher does fix a conclusion) or i. 66; but the writer, having the youth of Samuel on his mind, was doubtless led to use expressions which he found in the Old Testament concerning it. Let the reader also look at i. 56. and ii. 19. (not 20.)

† In the case of St. John, nothing can be more correct than the method adopted, on the supposition that the narrative is continuous; for *the subject is entirely dropped*, and a general remark is therefore in place. In ch. iii. 1, John is called the son of Zacharias, in clear allusion, we should say, to ch. i.; for he is never so called elsewhere in Scripture.

wants great determination to see anything but a most continuous narrative indeed. The remarkable circumstances of the infancy of Jesus have been narrated, and this verse, which follows immediately, and is esteemed so *general*, may well be so, for it embraces his history for twelve years, *professedly* giving no detail of it, but observing generally that for those years he grew in grace and wisdom;—and then the writer goes on to narrate a particular incident which took place when he was twelve years old.

We have now said all that we deem necessary to *explain* our objections to the *principles* on which Professor Schleiermacher has conducted his critical examination of St. Luke's Gospel; and we shall proceed to lay before our readers a few specimens of the execution of the work, as an additional proof of the justice of our charges. We will first state as briefly as possible the view taken of the two first chapters of the Gospel. Passing by the introductory verses, Professor Schleiermacher conceives the remainder of the first chapter to be a detached work,

(1) Because verse 80 is a general remark indicating a conclusion; for though (as we have said) the subject is actually dropped, yet in the preceding part of the narrative the birth of Christ had already been connected with that of John, and the general clause only breaks the thread of the narrative.

(2) If the same narrator proceeded in the second chapter, many things *ought to be differently stated*. Not to dwell on the fact that the birth of Christ is already exactly determined in the preceding chapter by relation to the birth of John, and that a more precise date is here out of place, what appears to Professor Schleiermacher decisive is, 'that the residence of Joseph and Mary in Nazareth, and Joseph's descent from David, are both mentioned a second time, in a manner *evidently implying* that we did not know these facts before.'—p. 24.

To Professor Schleiermacher's first reason we can say little, except that to us the subject does seem actually dropped, and a new one commenced; and that his reason therefore carries no weight with it. To the second we must reply, by totally dissenting from the position that there is any implication, far less any evident implication, that the reader might not know before the particulars *mentioned*, as Professor Schleiermacher says, but, as we think, he ought to have said, *alluded to*; for in ch. i. 26, 27, the abode of Joseph and Mary, and the descent of Joseph, are related *clearly to give information of them*, and with no other purpose. In the second chapter they are *not* so related, but introduced quite incidentally. "Every one went up to his proper place to be taxed according to his lineage, and therefore Joseph went out of Nazareth of Galilee to Bethlehem of Judæa, the city of David, because he was of the house of David." Such a

repetition would be no great fault in works of far higher pretensions than that of St. Luke; in works like his we confess that we are astonished to find, that even far more faulty instances should excite a remark. If we had been inclined to argue at all from such slight circumstances, we should have rather drawn an inference in favour of the unity of the writer, from finding him recur with such exactness to information he had already given on a point deemed of some importance. In the present case too, we should be inclined to say most decidedly, that Joseph (in ch. ii. 4.) is not introduced at all as one of whom the reader knew nothing; for the writer says, "And Joseph also went up from Galilee," &c.—a singular way assuredly of introducing a person to the reader's notice. If we may not argue from this that the writer was aware that he had before explained who Joseph was, we may yet say that another writer of the same time and style (see ch. i. 26, 27) thought it necessary to use a very different style of introducing to the reader this very person when about to speak of him. But Professor Schleiermacher says, that if the writer of the two chapters were the same person, and had repeated himself in this instance, he would have alluded also to the angelic message. It is, however, really straining matters beyond all reason, to say, that because a writer repeats himself in one instance, he will do so in any other we choose to point out as remarkable. We cannot possibly say this with any justice, without saying also that we can look into the mind of a writer, and see all his views and reasonings. He may, perhaps, be quite right in his judgment as to the propriety of repeating one statement and not another; but if he is wrong, would Professor Schleiermacher really argue that a writer cannot exercise an erroneous judgment on such trifles?—For ourselves, we should be quite willing to leave the decision of one point of the matter to any one without a theory, who will calmly read over the second chapter. We should, indeed, be surprised if he persuaded himself that the commencement of it, at all events, was ever written as a detached piece.—But we must proceed with Professor Schleiermacher, and we do so with some regret. Hitherto we have only found him discussing the Gospel of Luke as an uninspired history, and treating it with the freedom essential certainly to such a view, though out of tone with our feelings respecting it. But we now find him going farther, and considering a large portion of this first division of the Gospel as merely *poetic and fabulous*. Others have endeavoured to get rid of the two first chapters, as not belonging to the rest of the work; but Professor Schleiermacher not only impeaches them as the work of different writers from the remainder, but by a side-wind attempts

to destroy the value of a large part of them. His reasonings are as follows:—

(1) “No one will suppose that Gabriel announced the advent of Messiah in figures so purely Jewish, and in expressions taken mostly from the Old Testament; or that the alternate song between Elizabeth and Mary actually took place in the manner described; or that Zacharias at the instant of recovering his speech, used it to utter the hymn, without being disturbed by the joy and surprise of the company—by which the narrator himself allows his description to be interrupted. At all events we should be obliged to suppose that the author made additions of his own, and enriched the historical narrative by the lyrical effusions of his genius.”—p. 25.

In answer to the first remark, we must say that we cannot for a moment doubt that the real objection in Professor Schleiermacher’s mind is to the miraculous fact of an angel having come to announce the advent of the Messiah. If he will satisfy himself of that, we do not imagine that he will see anything very extraordinary in the fact that a superior being should, in condescension to human weakness, use expressions which were not only *familiar*, but *consecrated* ones, to the person he was addressing.

As to the second and third observations, one general remark applies, which we have had occasion to make before, that Professor Schleiermacher does not make the slightest allowance for excitement or elevation of mind under the most extraordinary circumstances, but requires, as a condition of probability, that in the midst of them persons should observe the forms, and keep up the routine of every-day life. We do not mean to treat the subject ludicrously, when we express our conviction that Professor Schleiermacher would have deemed the narration far more probable if it had stated that Elizabeth, on seeing Mary, had requested her to take refreshment and repose, after a journey which could not be otherwise than fatiguing—a circumstance, Professor Schleiermacher might add, to which every unprejudiced mind will the more readily assent, as it is especially mentioned that her journey was in the hilly country, and a hasty one. In the same way he would have found it far more natural, (in fact he almost says so,) that the good Zacharias should have received in form the congratulations of his assembled friends on the joyful recovery of his speech. We confess that in these points we hold that the writer has not only related what did happen, but what would most probably always happen under such circumstances. Our remark with respect to the coming of the angel, applies entirely to these other circumstances: if Professor Schleiermacher believes the miraculous part of them to be true, he will have little difficulty in admitting the extraordinary excitement of mind which

such miraculous events must cause; and that this excitement would break out into vehement and rapturous expressions. To speak of these expressions as lyrical effusions is somewhat unfair. We should not contend that under such, or any circumstances, a person could sing extempore a regular ode, divided into strophe, antistrophe, and epode; but the case is perfectly different in these instances: Jewish poetry was of all surely the most simple—parallelism was its essence; and when to that consideration we add another, that, among the Jews, a large part of their own Scriptures was written in this way, and perfectly familiar to them, and that there were doubtless innumerable compositions of the same kind and order, now lost, but then well known, and commemorative of all the events of their history, and all the joyful or mournful occasions of private life, the matter wears a different aspect. Would it be extraordinary even now, that a religious man, visited by a distinct and positive interposition of Divine Providence, should burst forth into the most fervent prayer, and prayer too which would bear the strongest marks of excitement of mind, and which would doubtless consist of the most elevated expressions which his familiarity with Scripture (with the work, we mean, connected in his mind with all his religious feelings, and familiar to him from his youth) could present to him. Why is it marvellous then, that a Jewish Priest, always familiar with these Scriptures, always engaged in the service of God, when struck dumb for a season in consequence of his doubts as to the promises of an heavenly messenger, should, on the recovery of his speech, utter the thoughts, on which he had been long brooding in his mind in consequence of the extraordinary visitation and its results, in words and phrases which had been familiar to him from his infancy?* It is the miraculous part of the story, beyond a doubt, which forms the only impediment to Professor Schleiermacher's allowing the probability of the rest.—But he goes on to say,

“(2) That in the historical part much will not admit of being understood as literal narrative. The chronology *depends* on the circumstance, which the author was desirous of introducing, that the child in Elizabeth's womb leaped for joy at Mary's approach, which is *therefore* deferred till the fifth month; and to leave no chasm in the whole the angel, for the same reason, *is made to come* no sooner, but immediately after his coming she sets out and stays three months with her cousin, which is improbable on account of her own approaching nuptials, in

* The same observation applies entirely to Simeon's Song. And with regard to the Song of the Virgin, so large a portion of it is taken from the Song of Hannah, familiar doubtless to every Jew at that time, and peculiarly applicable to her circumstances, that nothing can appear to us more probable than her using those powerful and beautiful expressions.

order that, upon her return, the birth of John might be immediately subjoined. Similar to this (we do not exactly understand what Professor Schleiermacher means) is the circumstance that Zacharias is punished with dumbness for his unbelief, and thus contrasted with Mary, who breaks forth, under divine inspiration, into songs of praise; and yet that, *though his unbelief must have ceased long before*, (this remark is really strange,) he does not recover his speech till the instant when, by confirming the name, he recognizes the angel's declaration of his son's calling."—pp. 25, 26. Thus "John's being a late-born child is *evidently only imagined* for the sake of analogy with the several heroes of Hebrew antiquity."—p. 28.

Nor would Professor Schleiermacher venture to pronounce the relation (p. 28) between the ages of John and Christ historical, any more than the relationship of their mothers, which it is difficult to reconcile with John's assertion, that he did not know Christ before his baptism. This latter supposition, he thinks, was probably only adopted as a foundation for Mary's visit to Elizabeth. All these statements are, in his opinion, to be explained by the occasion the poet had for them. Then "the whole grouping, the angel coming to Zacharias and announcing the last Prophet of the old Covenant in the Temple; the same coming to Mary afterwards, and announcing the coming of Messiah in the despised Nazareth; the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth; and the winding-up of the whole with Zacharias' restoration to speech, and his hymn, present to us a pleasing little composition completely in the style and manner of several Jewish poems still extant among our Apocryphal writings, written in all probability originally in Aramaic by a Christian of the more liberal Judaizing school, and of the general style of which a faithful image is conveyed in the early severe schools of Christian painting!" Now we trust that the admirers of Professor Schleiermacher will not think the worse of us for confessing that our indignation has been a good deal moved by this part of his work. But let us not be mistaken. If the Gospels can be *proved* spurious or fabulous, let them be rejected. We say with sincerity, that we desire truth, only truth. *Fiat justitia—ruat cælum.* But really it is too much to have our records thus whispered away, without a particle of evidence against them, and by means of a palpable sophism. Professor Schleiermacher will not *at once argue that no miraculous events took place*, but he tacitly assumes the monstrous position, that if miraculous events do happen, every circumstance connected with them must fall in with the routine of common life; and if he can show any deviation from it, he is quite satisfied that he has likewise shown the improbability of the history. It is strange, says he, that there should be the relation stated in the Gospel* between the ages of Christ and John; therefore it is a

* We are at a loss to comprehend Professor Schleiermacher's difficulty on this matter. If Jesus was the son of GOD, he can find no difficulty in believing that GOD

fable! This question should be met in a far different way, and a far different spirit. If a writer says that while he reverences the doctrines of Jesus, and has no doubt that he, like many other excellent men, received the *mediate* assistance of GOD, he has yet no belief in his having received *immediately* a divine mission, and that he is therefore compelled to disbelieve anything miraculous relating to his birth, he takes an intelligible ground, and we know how to meet it. Whether this is, or is not, Professor Schleiermacher's belief, we have no means of judging from this work.* He does not moot the point of miracles, but merely inquires whether the circumstances of the narration attending them are probable; and we cannot but think that this is unworthy both of his candour and of his talents. The argument seems to us to lie in a nutshell. Have we, or have we not, reason to believe that Christ was endowed with miraculous powers? If the question be decided in the affirmative, are we to reject circumstances related as to his birth, because they appear to one person strange, while perhaps another may see nothing strange in them? If in the negative, dispute is unnecessary. But if we look at the particulars to which Professor Schleiermacher has objected, will his objections bear an argument? "The writer has made John a late-born child because other Hebrew heroes were so." What is this, in fact, but an unsupported *opinion*? Then, "if Mary and Elizabeth were related, how happens it that John did not personally know Christ?" Can Professor Schleiermacher mean *seriously* to found any objection to the truth of the history on a fact of the commonest occurrence even in daily life? He may say, perhaps, that the extraordinary revelations made to the mothers, render a subsequent intercourse more *probable*; but it is such a vague sort of probability as the simplest fact † is sufficient to overturn.

Professor Schleiermacher, however, endeavours to *show* that much of the matter in Luke, ch. i. contradicts what we find in Matt. ch. i., and that therefore one or other must be false. But before he casts discredit on historical writers, he must show *distinct* contradictions, not mere difficulties, arising, perhaps, from his own fancies, or from our total ignorance of many minute

might also ordain the birth of a Precursor, such as the Jews expected. If he thinks that Jesus was a mere man, what is the difficulty of the fact narrated, that the son of a relation was born a few months before him? What need of poetical fancy for inventing such a fact?

* In Bretschneider's *Apologie der neuen Theologie* (a reply to Mr. Rose's work on German Protestantism) Schleiermacher and Marheineke are described as men "who use the Church-system to dress up a Philosophical system in" (p. 53); and this appears to us a fair account of Schleiermacher's great work, *Der Christliche Glaube*, as far as we understand it.

† If any part of this first chapter could be allowed by Professor Schleiermacher to stand, we should mention that this ignorance is actually accounted for by verse 80.

details of the event mentioned, and many peculiar habits of the time.

“If the history of the annunciation is true,” he says, “Joseph’s doubts and their decision, as related by Matthew, are inconceivable. For even admitting that Mary set out on her journey to Elizabeth without saying any thing to Joseph, and that he learned her pregnancy and the annunciation by a third person during her absence, yet Mary, before *coming to an understanding* with Joseph on this important point, must at least have felt some uncertainty, *which however we do not observe in her language at the house of Elizabeth*, and which would have rendered it impossible for her, without the greatest indifference for her espoused husband, to pass three months there.” “And besides,” asks Professor Schleiermacher, “what necessity was there for Joseph to decide on this matter by himself, before he had spoken to Mary? Especially if, according to Paulus’s supposition, Mary, and *therefore of course he too*, had been previously apprised of the vision seen by Zacharias. If, on the other hand, Mary told him of her reception at the house of Elizabeth, and the evident connexion between the two visions, *he must have believed*, even without the appearance of an angel.”—p. 45.

Now no one can fail to perceive that the whole difficulty *which Professor Schleiermacher finds* (whether there is any in reality we do not now say) is of his own creating, and arises from his view of what the parties would and ought to do. If Mary told Joseph, he would have believed, without the appearance of an angel! If Mary had been apprised of the vision of Zacharias, of course so had Joseph! If Mary had not spoken to Joseph, she must have been in anxiety during all her stay with Elizabeth, and, strange to tell, Professor Schleiermacher finds no marks of this anxiety in a single speech which she made on first seeing Elizabeth under these extraordinary and exciting circumstances! And, on these vague and uncertain probabilities, is it possible that Professor Schleiermacher can seek to destroy the credit of a history? In the circumstances which the two histories give us, we can discern nothing in the slightest degree contradictory. A heavenly messenger comes to Mary, and informs her of her own lot and of that of Elizabeth. She goes immediately to Elizabeth, and remains with her three months. On her return, her pregnancy is visible, and Joseph, either shocked at the fact which he could not mistake, and therefore feeling all question unnecessary, or perhaps on hearing from her her miraculous history, not at first giving credence to it, resolves to put her away. Then a heavenly messenger is sent to him also. The *circumstances* of both histories are comprised in what we have stated. Let us briefly examine it. The first difficulty is, that Mary should have gone to Elizabeth without communicating with Joseph. With reference to a case out of the common course of nature, we feel

it utterly impossible to know what would be the natural course; whether, in a betrothed bride, we should expect ready communication with her bridegroom at once, on such a matter, or silence and retirement. But, perhaps, common events might prevent communication, if she had desired it. We know little of the facility of intercourse between males and females in Judæa, and especially of young and marriageable females. And, as it is clear that Mary's journey followed the annunciation closely, (for the writer expressly says that she went with haste,) it cannot be reckoned very improbable, that an opportunity of communication might not be offered. Her lengthened stay with Elizabeth is undoubtedly more difficult to account for; but we must observe that Professor Schleiermacher heightens that difficulty unnecessarily, by saying, or at least implying, that she felt no uncertainty, no anxiety about her situation, and her betrothed husband, during that time. He finds no trace of it, doubtless, in her expressions of joy on arriving, but no unprejudiced man could thence draw any inference as to her subsequent feelings. We would ask, too, whether a much less degree of ingenuity than that which Professor Schleiermacher has exerted on many occasions to prove the Evangelists wrong, might not have enabled him to offer many a conjecture to account for Mary's stay, and prove them right? Is it a monstrous thing to suppose, for example, that Joseph might have been absent for some private reason of business from Nazareth for a considerable period, and that Mary was aware of it? This conjecture may be perfectly wide of the truth, but how many other similar natural events are there which might explain the stay of Mary at a distance from home for this remarkable period.

With respect to what occurred afterwards, the improbability alleged really appears to us to be none. If Joseph saw the state of Mary, or heard of it, it is perfectly natural that he should resolve to dismiss her without inquiry on a subject, which he might well think could admit of none. But we incline to *think* that he did inquire, and that he heard her story—that he was staggered by it, but not convinced; and that that supposition gives us a satisfactory explanation of the middle course which he pursued. He could not fully credit her story, and therefore resolved to dismiss her; but he was so far affected by it, that he would not bring on her the disgrace of a public renunciation.

Professor Schleiermacher afterwards (p. 49) says that he thinks there was some traditional foundation for our history, and supposes that expectations had been excited in an *extraordinary* manner in Mary, previously to the birth of Jesus, that she was to be the mother of the Son of God—that she may even have communicated to Joseph the ground of her expectations; but if these

were grounded on signs not perfectly clear, or distinctly connected with actual events, he might incline to doubt. And this he himself thinks is reconcilable with Matthew's history. But we would ask if this is not splitting hairs. Professor Schleiermacher can bring himself to believe that Joseph might entertain doubts if Mary informed him that she was pregnant, but yet innocent, and that expectations had been excited in her in an extraordinary manner that she was to be the mother of the Son of God. He might doubt, says Professor Schleiermacher, virtually, whether a virgin could conceive or not—on that difficulty he might come to no decision; but he could not have doubted for a moment if she had told him also of her reception at Elizabeth's, and the two visions. He might think so well of her as not at once to reject the extraordinary story which she told of her pregnancy, in contradiction to the whole course of nature for above three thousand years, and yet not be able to give full credit to it, unless she added the history of a revelation from heaven. He might go a thousand steps with her—that is not strange; but it is quite natural that he should not make up his mind to go a thousand and one. If that one additional step could not be got over, he must have believed, says Professor Schleiermacher, without the intervention of an angel. We think not. If he at all got over the tremendous difficulty of her conceiving, though innocent—that is, if he did not at once reject her story on that ground, subsequently the difference between entire disbelief and belief could never be caused by her stating that she had expectations roused in an extraordinary manner—or by a direct revelation. Mary's credibility must have been the question. If he could bring himself to believe that she might have told a falsehood as to her pregnancy, he could find no difficulty in believing also that she would defend that falsehood by another. To reject Luke's account, therefore, because it says that an angel appeared to Mary, while it would be reckoned admissible if it only stated the immaculate conception, confirmed by expectations excited in an extraordinary manner, is really to exercise a degree of critical acumen far too great for ordinary readers.

But Matthew fares no better than Luke, for though the first half of Matthew's history of the circumstances attending our Lord's birth is preferred, his last half is as decidedly condemned. The coming of the Magi is quite irreconcilable, says Professor Schleiermacher, with St. Luke's narrative. His difficulty is simply his conviction that the Magi, if they came at all, must have been at Bethlehem *before* Jesus's presentation, and that St. Luke makes the parents return immediately to Nazareth. It would destroy the *vividness* of Luke's narrative, he says, (p. 40,) to suppose that their return to Bethlehem was merely omitted.

And, besides, there are many reasons against it:—“(1.) Joseph went to Bethlehem solely on account of the registry; (2.) Mary had been ill accommodated there in her labour; (3.) they would have disliked the fatigue of a double journey; besides, (4.) as Bethlehem was near Jerusalem, if the Magi had arrived before the presentation, intelligence would have reached Bethlehem of Herod’s inquiries after the birth-place of the Messiah, and that the Magi discovered it by the direction thence obtained; and (5.) the Magi must have had the dream which warned them against returning to Jerusalem at Bethlehem, and it is more probable that they related than that they suppressed it.” That Bethlehem was not the residence of Joseph, and that he intended no long stay there, is, we have no doubt, quite true, and we willingly allow the truth of Professor Schleiermacher’s first observation; but it by no means goes to show that Joseph did not return at all to Bethlehem. For that place was little more than six miles from Jerusalem; if the presentation took place at all, Joseph must have been *domiciled* there for forty days; and then where is the improbability that he should have gone to Jerusalem with Mary, and returned again to Bethlehem—a business altogether of about four or five hours—previously to his longer journey. “But no!” says Professor Schleiermacher, “he would never have returned to a place where Mary was so ill-accommodated in her labour.” That she fared ill in the crowd of strangers who were there for the registry is true, but why should Professor Schleiermacher choose to imagine that, after the crowd was gone, probably in a few hours, or in a day or two, the inconvenience still continued? This is mere prejudice in favour of his own theory. Again, he says, “that Joseph and Mary would have disliked the *fatigue* of a double *journey*.” This is really curious. The *fatigue* of a journey of twelve or thirteen miles! No one certainly travels twelve or thirteen miles unnecessarily; but how trifling, how far below the dignity of history are the circumstances which would make these twelve miles not unnecessary, and fully account for the wonder of a morning excursion! “But still,” argues Professor Schleiermacher, “near as Bethlehem was to Jerusalem, (for he now remembers their proximity,) intelligence of Herod’s inquiries would have reached that place.” It appears to us very doubtful whether there is any reason to suppose, that intelligence of Herod’s inquiries would necessarily reach a petty village and its obscure inhabitants. But even if it had, Mr. Benson has amply shown that there was nothing in the nature of Herod’s inquiries to awaken suspicion of danger in the mind of Joseph, and that, on the contrary, Herod, for obvious reasons, probably professed an anxiety to pay due adoration to the Messiah. We would recommend to our readers the

perusal of the third chapter of Mr. Benson's very acute inquiry into the Chronology of Christ's Life, in which they will find strong reasons offered for believing that the Magi arrived in *Jerusalem before*, and in *Bethlehem after*, the presentation; a view of the subject which gets rid of many difficulties, and to which no objection, arising from any improbability in the details of it, can be made. Indeed, we feel assured that Professor Schleiermacher would himself feel strong sentiments of admiration at an ingenuity equal to his own, employed in confirming what it is his purpose to subvert. Mr. Benson offers a probable solution of the difficulties; Professor Schleiermacher cuts the knot by saying that the history of the Magi is

“ a *symbolical* narrative, the origin of which is probably to be looked for on the Eastern confines of Palestine, brought into connexion with a real event; for the massacre of the infants can scarcely be a *mere fiction*.”—(p. 50.) “ Here then,” he continues, “ Matthew, having introduced some *poetical elements* into his narrative, would recede, and Luke would keep the historical field. Can it at all lessen the credibility of the two Evangelists, that each admitted into his history some passages not purely historical?”

To this question Professor Schleiermacher answers, “ certainly not with a candid judge,” because (1.) all this is a prelude to the real history; (2.) in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, whence they and their readers drew their chief intellectual food, *poetry and history are nowhere kept quite distinct*, and therefore the Evangelists neither could have, nor needed, (as their readers would be like themselves,) that discriminating sense which is peculiar to us; and (3.) their purity of feeling has kept them from the extravagance and romance of the exploded Gospels, “ a contrast which,” says Professor Schleiermacher, “ upholds our canonical Evangelists in their just authority, and show us the spirit in which they proceeded in its dignity and sanctity.”

We confess we should answer the question in a very different way, and say, that our faith in the Gospels, as a book for the guidance of our belief, was gone at once, if we could persuade ourselves that the writers admitted poetic fictions, and symbolical narratives, into their history. Nor are we led to doubt the justice of our own answer, by the arguments with which Professor Schleiermacher supports his. For first of all, what defence can there be for introducing poetic fictions into the beginning, more than into the body or end of a narrative? A Teacher professes to come from God; his historians give us such miraculous accounts of his birth as show his superiority to mankind, a point of the greatest consequence for us to know—but we are lucky enough to find out that these miraculous histories are

poetic and symbolical, and the historian's defence for thus misleading us on most essential and important points is to be, that all this related not to the actions of this Teacher when in the world, but to the method of his coming into it. We have, perhaps, no right to infer Professor Schleiermacher's opinions from such expressions, but we may be allowed to say, that the only person from whom they ought to come is one who has no belief in any *immediate* mission of Jesus, but considers him as a great moral Teacher, under the mediate guidance of God. But Professor Schleiermacher says that the Jews were used to a similar mixture of poetry and history. This assertion we must beg leave to meet with a direct contradiction. We are well aware that poetry is constantly *introduced* into the Scriptures of the Old Testament, witness the songs of Moses, Miriam, Deborah, and of Hannah, and that prophetic poetry and history are interchanged; but we mean distinctly to deny that in the Old Testament Professor Schleiermacher can bring forward passages, *purporting to be narrations of facts*, which are nevertheless mere poetical exercises of the writer's imagination, or at best founded on vague traditions. And, last of all, while we fully admit the difference between the canonical and exploded Gospels, we must beg leave to ask Professor Schleiermacher and his translator,* who appears to share in this opinion, whether they really believe that,

* The learned translator (Pref. p. xix.) says that "the operation of the Spirit is not to be sought in any temporary, physical, or even intellectual changes, wrought on its subjects, but in the continual presence and action of what is most vital and essential in Christianity itself." He has previously said (p. xviii.) that comparing these Gospels with the fragments of others so full of delusions, prejudice, &c. we shall easily believe that our Evangelists "were filled with that Spirit which was to lead into all truth." We need not, we trust, assure him of our earnest desire neither to mistake nor misrepresent him; but we are compelled to believe, from these passages, that he intends, like Professor Schleiermacher, to convey the idea that the superiority of our Gospels is owing to the purity of feeling in the writers, arising from the temper and spirit of Christianity. Now, let us consider the case a little more closely. No inspiration can be needed as to facts of which we were eye-witnesses; nor as to those which we receive from full and credible testimony. But, in the case of St. Luke, he is supposed to take up compilations of narratives, that is to say, narratives at *third* or *fourth* hand. Here some assistance is required, to enable him to distinguish truth from falsehood, actual facts from romance. Does the learned translator then mean that Christianity would so purify his feelings as to give him that taste and discernment which should at once distinguish between fact and exaggeration? We trust that we do not yield to him in a full and fixed belief that Christianity does indeed both exalt and purify the intellect, but this is going farther than we are prepared to do, for we can readily believe that gospels, containing many fictions, were written in early times by sincere but ignorant Christians. But if, on the other hand, the learned translator means that that blessed Spirit, whose agency is necessary in the conversion and purification of the heart of every Christian, *himself* so acted on the mind of the Apostle, though *mediately* only, we cannot see that he has at all, as he imagines, got over the difficulty relating to inspiration. For he must remember that the question here relates to the *end*, not the *means*. If the writer was indeed led to avoid the errors of others, the *supernatural* assistance of the Spirit is equally established, whether his agency may have been *mediate* or *immediate*.

while other Christian writers were “possessed with the confused spirit of Rabbinical Judaism,” and thus fell into romance or extravagance, mere purity of feeling would have preserved our Evangelists from these faults?

We have thus finished our examination of what Professor Schleiermacher considers the first of his four great divisions of the Gospels. We are quite unable to go with equal minuteness of detail into the remainder. But we shall give two or three specimens, taken at random, which will, we think, confirm the opinions we have previously offered. The following account of the first section of the second division will prove that the theory to which Professor Schleiermacher has been led by his examination of the Gospel, is not entitled to acceptance, on account of any peculiar simplicity in its machinery. This first section of Div. II. contains the third chapter and the first fifteen verses of the fourth, in all fifty-three verses, or perhaps three octavo pages. The account given of it is as follows—that it consists of four parts—that section 1. (ch. iii. 1—20) is an epitome of a longer memoir of John the Baptist’s life—that section 2. (vs. 21 and 22), containing the account of our Lord’s Baptism, is a separate narrative—that section 3. (to the end of ch. iii.) containing the genealogy, is another separate narrative on which Luke lighted—and that the same is true of section 4. containing ch. iv. 1—15;—that Luke found (1) (2) and (4) already united, and thrust (3) in, not finding a better place for it; that (2) was a wrong version of the original account given by the Baptist to John the Evangelist, and (4) containing the Temptation was a mere misunderstanding, by which a parable has been converted into a history.

Let us now consider what a ponderous machinery we have here to account for about fifty verses.—A writer of memoirs of the Baptist—an epitomizer of the same—three separate narrative-writers, two of them so ignorant and ill-informed as to mistake and mistate important matters—an early compiler—and, last of all, Luke himself—seven persons in all. We are far from saying that simplicity is a *necessary* quality in a theory which is to account for the composition of any given work; but, at least, we may expect that the steps, if many, should be easy and natural. While we are on this matter, we will give another example of the difficulties which this theory involves, while it professes to solve others. There is, undoubtedly, a difficulty in St. Luke’s arrangement, where he is narrating the call of St. Peter. The two preceding Evangelists tell us that *after* the calling of Simon Peter, our Lord went to his house and cured his mother-in-law; St. Mark expressly adding, that he did so after rebuking an unclean spirit, and that at that time Simon was with him. All this is clear

and natural, but St. Luke makes the cure of the mother-in-law *prior* to the calling of Simon, an arrangement certainly full of difficulty in itself, (for it would suppose Simon insensible to two miracles, and only converted by a third, see p. 75,) as well as contradictory to that of the other Evangelists. How does Professor Schleiermacher account for this? He tells us (p. 68) that there are here a great number of detached narratives; that these were put together by some compiler, (p. 76,) who *regarding only the miraculous import* was less concerned about the natural order of his narratives, learned this later, and, as he learned it, annexed it subsequently to the others; and that St. Luke gives us this compilation unaltered. First of all, there is here an entirely arbitrary and *wholly unsupported* assumption of the compiler's views and motives. But let us give Professor Schleiermacher the full benefit of this, and then let us ask whether his suppositions do not exactly *double* the difficulty of the case. That a *writer* might have some reason for changing the order of events, though we do not discern it, is conceivable; but that first one, and then another compiler, who could have no reason for making an absurd order, should voluntarily do so, that neither of them should be struck with an absurdity quite obvious to us, appears to us as hopeless a way of solving difficulties as can be imagined. Again, if in a writer we choose to attribute this faulty arrangement to blunder or inadvertence, according to Professor Schleiermacher we have to suppose two blunderers instead of one. The reason, too, alleged by Professor Schleiermacher appears to us most singular. He assumes that the compiler got this account later, (and by such assumptions what is there for which we could not account?) and then says, that *therefore* he annexed it at the end of the other narratives. Professor Schleiermacher, it appears to us, must have singular ideas as to the process of annexation. Is compiling half a dozen narratives a matter of so tremendous a difficulty; and, on the other hand, is a clear account of so little importance to a compiler, that he would not take the trouble of copying two or three short narratives a second time, for the purpose of setting things in their right order? Just above we found Professor Schleiermacher himself supposing that St. Luke thrust the genealogy into a compilation already made, (and in that view not at all connected with it,) and we should therefore gladly know, if the first compiler had been idle or careless enough not to do so in this case, why are we to suppose that St. Luke had also lost his understanding, or his power of insertion? And we must add, that we are at a loss to perceive any difference, in such a case, between an author and a compiler which can be in favour of the latter. For a compiler is not freed from the laws of common

sense more than an author; at least, we are unable to conceive what ideas could have prevailed in the mind of a person compiling a history of the life of an individual, if he felt himself obliged to present all the fragmentary documents which offered themselves, just as he found them, even though the arrangement shocked common sense. This observation is the more necessary, because with relation to one part of this history of St. Peter, (viz. St. Luke's abrupt introduction of him,) Professor Schleiermacher observes, that although it would be indefensible in a *writer* to introduce so remarkable a person without prelude or preface, "the case (p. 73) is quite different if he is here communicating a document which he found already existing, since a person who related or set down this history by itself for the benefit of one who knew, independently of it, who Peter was, could have no inducement formally to introduce and present him." Certainly such a writer might not; but would Professor Schleiermacher argue thence that a compiler stands exactly in the same predicament, and that he would not be at all alive to the awkwardness of such a proceeding? If he really maintains this, maintains, we mean, that the compiler would not feel himself obliged to make any alteration in order to introduce to the reader of his history the personages whom he found abruptly mentioned in his separate narratives, we cannot but notice the marvellous, the almost miraculous good fortune which has attended him elsewhere; for in no other case is *any person whatever* abruptly introduced* in this way.

Our last specimen relates to a matter to which we have already

* We wish to say nothing without proof, and therefore adduce it. Ch. i. 5. Herod the king of Judea; a certain priest named Zacharias, &c.; and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name, &c. Ch. i. 27. A virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the virgin's name, &c. Ch. ii. 25. There was a man in Jerusalem named Simeon, &c.—v. 36. There was one Anna, a prophetess, and the daughter of Phael, of the tribe of Aser. Ch. v. 10. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon.—v. 27. A publican named Levi. Ch. viii. 2 and 3. Certain women which had been healed of evil spirits, &c.; Mary, called Magdalene, out of whom, &c.; And Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, (this is an exception, but it is hardly one.)—v. 41. A man, named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the Synagogue. Ch. ix. 7. Herod, the Tetrarch. Ch. xi. 38. He entered into a certain village, and a certain woman, named Martha, &c. and she had a sister named Mary, &c. Ch. xviii. 2. There was a man, named Zacchæus, which was the chief of the publicans, and he was rich, &c. Ch. xxiii. 50. There was a man, named Joseph, a counsellor, and he was good and just; and he was of Arimathea, &c. These are *all* the instances where persons are mentioned by *name* in St. Luke's Gospel, and it would certainly be singularly fortunate if in no one of these cases a name was abruptly used in a separate narrative. Surely, Joseph, Mary, and Mary Magdalene, must have been persons quite as well known in those days as Peter himself among those who would have written these separate narratives, and they must have been aware, in each case, that (to use Professor Schleiermacher's own words) the persons for whose benefit they related or set down these histories knew independently, who Mary, and Mary Magdalene, and Joseph, and Simeon, and Anna were.

adverted, the calling of the Apostles, in chap. vi. and perhaps contains as fair an exemplification of the faults of Professor Schleiermacher's style of reasoning as can be found in the whole volume. Professor Schleiermacher delivers it, as his decided opinion, (p. 92.) that no solemn calling or ordination of the Apostles ever took place; for (1) he contends that the author never intended here to relate any thing of the sort, and (2) while he allows that St. Mark "most certainly" says that "Christ really ordained the twelve" on this occasion, he explains this awkward fact by saying, that Mark's narrative is taken from what now stands in Luke; and that "he has only to say, that Mark was probably the first person who misunderstood it!" Now, first of all, what is to justify this arbitrary assumption as to Mark having borrowed his account from Luke's narrative? There is no verbal agreement, at least, between them; and the only reason offered by Professor Schleiermacher for thinking that St. Mark's information is not derived from his own inquiry is, that the order of events at this part of his Gospel does not appear to the Professor to be in any keeping. We need hardly observe how slight a ground of objection this is, even if well-grounded, and how exceedingly liable to be exaggerated by the operation of mere fancy, unless the want of probability be gross and glaring. But next, Professor Schleiermacher assumes not only that St. Mark had seen, altered, and spoiled *some* existing documents, but that he had seen the compilation standing in this part of St. Luke, and that he mixes this up in a confused and unnatural way with St. Matthew's narrative. Now it cannot be too often repeated, that although we may fairly endeavour to account for difficulties in any work under examination by *attempting* to trace the way in which the information contained in it was gained, yet to assume the success of that attempt in a matter affecting the writer's credit is quite unreasonable, and is, in fact, assuming the very point in dispute. But we will allow to Professor Schleiermacher, if he pleases, that St. Mark did take his information from St. Luke, and will confidently ask again, whether it is probable, we had almost said possible, that he should have misunderstood him? If, indeed, a man under St. Mark's circumstances, living at his time and enjoying his advantages, did not know the fact whether the Apostles were called or not,—if he could, by *any* document, be betrayed into a false assertion as to so important a matter of fact, or be so careless as not to inquire,—if such suppositions be admissible, what possible value can we attach to his or to any Gospel, nay, to any contemporary testimony on a matter of history?

But let us pass to the grounds on which Professor Schleier-

macher's assertion as to St. Luke's meaning is founded. The words of the original are (Luke, vi. 13—17.) *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα προσεφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε.* (Then follow their names.) *Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν, ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπῳ πεδινῷ.* "Now these words," says Professor Schleiermacher, "cannot possibly express a great, solemn, and very important fact, because *ἐκλεξάμενος* is evidently separated from *ὠνόμασε*, (the latter being referred to an entirely different epoch, however we translate the phrase; whereas, if a connexion between them had been meant, it must have run *ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα καὶ ὀνομάσας αὐτὰς ἀποστόλους*) and stands closely connected with *καταβὰς* between *προσεφώνησε* and *ἔστη*." "Would such an act," he asks, "in a free description of which conciseness is not the prevailing character, have been confined to a parenthesis?"* In answer, we must beg to say, that the criticism on the words is quite futile, except so far as this, that the expression suggested by Professor Schleiermacher would undoubtedly be more easy and natural. But we are amazed at finding that he thence argues that it must have been used. He says that *ὠνόμασε* must be referred to a different epoch, whether we translate, "whom also he had *before* called Apostles," or, "whom also he *afterwards* called Apostles." But we would beg to ask if the writer meant to say, "whom also he *then* named Apostles," (allowing, as we have done, that the phrase is more awkward than that suggested by Professor Schleiermacher,) what other part of the verb he could use?

But again, even on our view of the Gospels, considering them, that is to say, as drawn up for the purpose of giving a connected account of the most important transactions and doctrines of our Lord, the argument from the parenthetical way of noticing this great act is of trifling weight, for it is almost a characteristic of the Gospels to relate the most important facts and the most astonishing miracles, we had almost said carelessly, but certainly, with the most entire simplicity and the most entire absence of all attempts to produce effect. But it is most extraordinary that this argument should have been made by a writer who considers the Gospel of Luke as a compilation of narratives drawn up by different persons and for different objects; for unless the particular object of the narrative embodied in this part of the Gospel had been the calling of the Apostles, there could be no reason why the writer should not notice, *in transitu*, this or any other

* There is a book called "Ueber die quellen des Evangeliums des Marcus," by a disciple of Schleiermacher's, called Saunier, (Berlin, 1825) in which the same objections are repeated.

important fact, *not being his main object*, and hasten on to that whatever it might be. But still farther, Professor S. positively asserts, (p. 93) that a collector of historical materials who inquired on the spot, would scarcely have received, anywhere, any other answer than that the peculiar relation of the Twelve assumed its subsequent form gradually and of itself. This answer, he thinks, is given by the silence of Matthew and John, and is in itself the most probable state of the case, for it must have depended very much on external circumstances, whether any one could enter into this relation. The argument from the *silence of Matthew* is not quite fairly stated, for so far from his being silent, he mentions (ch. xi.) that Jesus called his twelve Apostles (whose names are there recited as in Luke and Mark,) to him on a particular occasion, gave them miraculous powers, and after this solemn ordination, sent them forth to preach. St. John never even enumerates the disciples, and therefore little can be inferred from his silence; but when he does speak, as we shall see below, he speaks very awkwardly for Professor Schleiermacher's theory. Then, as to the probability of the matter, so differently do probabilities strike different minds, (and so vague, consequently, is the judgment to be formed from them,) that to many it would appear not only probable, but highly probable, that at the outset of a scheme which was to be entrusted to human hands, its Divine Author would assuredly attach to himself certain immediate friends to whom he might explain his views and wishes, and whose instrumentality he might use in accomplishing them. And in this particular case, it is quite obvious to inquire why there was a *definite* number of followers, unless something more positive than mere chance or convenience, depending on external circumstances, dictated their number.

But Professor Schleiermacher asks whether, "if Christ really by an act of his pleasure had called the Twelve it would be possible satisfactorily to vindicate his wisdom from the objection that men, *evidently more distinguished* than many of the Twelve, made their appearance after his death too soon not to have been of the number of his immediate disciples?"* *Evidently more distinguished!* If Professor Schleiermacher supposes Christ to have been a mere man, would he really at this distance of time either presume to judge of the wisdom of a choice, of all the circum-

* We are totally at a loss to imagine to whom Professor Schleiermacher refers. Matthias and Barnabas (if he were the same as Joseph called Barsabas, which is not very probable) are the only two we can recall as probably among our Lord's own disciples, and afterwards engaged in promoting his cause. That they were superior to the others we have yet to learn.

stances of which he must be and is wholly ignorant, or build any argument on his own fancies on such a subject? “But the goodness of Jesus in calling Judas, and so disposing of his soul,” says Professor Schleiermacher, “could not be vindicated, while the difficulty is less, if there was no particular call on his side:” an observation to which we can by no means assent; for he who *knowingly* permits another to run into danger, and he who advises him to do so, that advice not being compulsory, differs not much in degree, and not at all in kind, of culpability. Whatever, therefore, explains Christ’s design in *permitting* Judas to become an Apostle, explains also his design in giving him a call to that office. But last of all, what says Professor Schleiermacher to the word ἐκλεξάμενος. He says that its sense must be determined by the context, and we have already shown what he makes of the context. On the other hand, we must beg to assert that there is no need whatever to recur to the context, for the sense of the word is not doubtful, nor its *constant* application to this very matter. First of all, let us observe that in the Acts, i. 2. we have the phrase, Ἐντειλόμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἄγιου ὁ εἰς ἐξελέξατο,—that at the choice of a new Apostle (Acts, i. 24.) this word is again used (Ἀναδείξον ὃν ἐξελέξω) in a way which bears directly on our argument;—and then that it is applied (Acts, vi. 5.) to the choice of deacons.* Next we must quote some strong expressions of St. John, which to us at least seem to put the matter beyond all dispute. In ch. vi. 70. we have the following, “Have I not chosen (ἐξελεξάμεν) you *the twelve*, and one of you is a devil?” And again in ch. xv. 16. (directly in the teeth of Professor Schleiermacher) “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen (ἐξελεξάμεν) you.” The passage in ch. xiii. 18. respecting Judas is also most remarkable. “I know whom I have chosen, (ἐξελεξάμεν) but, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, he that eateth,” &c.†

We shall here conclude our examination of Professor Schleiermacher’s work. It may, perhaps, be thought that we ought to examine, and, if possible, refute his positions in detail. But we doubt, after all, whether this is necessary. If, indeed, it should be determined that he is at liberty to give what views he pleases of every subject mentioned in the Gospel, by supplying arbitrary

* There is a curious awkwardness of syntax in that place, recalling to mind what Professor Schleiermacher said as to the passage we have been treating of; καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, (and six others then enumerated,) ὅς ἔστησαν ἐνάπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων. Here, as well as in the place of St. Luke, καὶ would be preferable to ὅς.

† Professor Schleiermacher’s account of the Transfiguration is even more objectionable than this passage on the calling of the Apostles. We regret our inability to notice it.

and unsupported details, and then to explain the transaction by means of them; if he may be allowed to decide on all occasions that some of the Evangelists, or their reporters, have been deceived and mistaken, and that their statements arise from a total inability to comprehend at the time what we clearly understand even now; if he may be allowed at his pleasure to impute exaggeration and a love of the marvellous to one, stupidity to another, and false information to a third; if he really has any claim to the exercise of these and similar licenses, no doubt his work demands a closer investigation, but not till these concessions are made; for nine out of ten of his separations of one part of the Gospel from that preceding it, are built entirely on circumstantial evidence supplied by himself, and by the licenses in which he has allowed himself. Granting him these, we are quite ready to acknowledge the great ingenuity which he has displayed in attaining his conclusions; but then, granting these, what is there which a man of his extraordinary talents, nay, with powers far inferior to his, could not establish? On these grounds we should think it unnecessary at present to go further into the details of his work, even if we had space for it. This is the main point to be attended to both by his admirers and by those who, like ourselves, dissent from his views; for before any real progress can be made in this great and curious question, it must be finally determined whether such methods of discussion as Professor Schleiermacher has resorted to, are admissible. Had we not felt ourselves bound to look at the matter in this light, there are many minor points to which we should certainly have adverted. The interpretations of Scripture offered by Professor Schleiermacher are well worthy of examination. We do not think he shines in this respect; nevertheless any novel explanations offered by a person of his learning and sagacity, must deserve attention.* We could point out also, with pleasure, several instances of rare ingenuity and felicity† in explaining the connexion of obscure passages in the Gospel of St. Luke. But these cannot but be expected in the works of Schleiermacher. They are the natural growth of a mind like his; while the views which we have combated appear to us like so many noxious weeds which have no business in such a soil.

In conclusion, we must say that Professor Schleiermacher's work is in one respect truly valuable. It declares him to be

* As a specimen of strange and far-fetched interpretation, we would especially beg our readers to look to the whole exposition of the sixteenth chapter.

† We would refer to the observation in p. 98, ("The great and almost literal," &c.); to the very ingenious, though fanciful, remarks in p. 107, ("The reporter," &c.); and to almost the whole paragraph beginning in p. 140 and ending in p. 144.

among the opponents of the theory of a single original document. The authority of his name is great, and still greater when we remember that he is not prevented by any dogmatical views from adopting whatever opinion might recommend itself by its semblance of truth. The names of Eichhorn and of Bishop Marsh have obtained for that theory more credit than it deserved. It must, therefore, be highly satisfactory to many laborious inquirers after truth, perplexed by a difficult subject, and oppressed by the authority of persons who have well sustained their reputation by the ingenuity with which they have advocated their theory, to find that a critic inferior to no one who has touched on the subject, and perfectly unshackled in his opinions, after minute and laborious investigation, has pronounced that theory unsatisfactory. That the view which he seeks to substitute may be not less so, is no answer. The objections offered to the old theory are not invalidated by the feebleness of the new one, for it would be a very bad reason to allege for persevering in a road which we know will lead us wrong, that we have not yet found one which will carry us right. That there are many such laborious inquirers among our English divines we would fain hope; for we agree entirely with the translator, that this is not a question to be passed over in silence. If false theories on such a subject have been offered, they ought to be refuted; if long investigation has produced a belief that the phenomena can never be accounted for, then the question should be set at rest by the production of reasons sufficiently valid to justify such a belief; and, finally, if, as we have reason to believe, some candid and able inquirers have convinced themselves that the phenomena are not such as to require any explanation, they too would do a great service by showing the truth of an opinion at first sight somewhat startling. Beyond the loss of the invaluable information which such an inquiry is calculated to elicit, no great practical evil has, perhaps, yet arisen from the silence of our English writers on this point. But they would now turn their attention to it with great advantage; they have before them a variety of theories proposed and advocated by men of high eminence, and may gather from them a rich harvest of materials, the fruits of long observation and of great acuteness. They would come to the inquiry too with what we should believe a great advantage, that is to say, a firm belief in the truth of Christianity. Many of those who have discussed the question in Germany have had no belief in Christianity as a divine revelation, and have had in consequence the most unjust contempt for the Apostles and Evangelists—a feeling which has in many cases given a singular obliquity to their

opinion. Even they who share in this unbelief cannot deny that there is a greater probability of eliciting truth on a given question by its being considered from very different points of view.

We have said that no practical evil has yet resulted from our English divines not having applied themselves to this great question. We wish we could say as much for the silence which prevails too much in this country on Biblical criticism in general. It is a subject, indeed, which appears to be in very bad odour among us, though for what reason we are a loss to conceive. That it has, under the guidance of certain opinions, led to evil and falsehood in many German writers, is most true; but they who dread the subject on that account must be influenced by strange feelings as to the truth of their belief in revelation. If the Bible is the basis of our faith, the more it is studied, the more it is made the chief object of study, the better. Nay, the very fact that the criticism of the Bible has been perverted to evil, is a very powerful reason why it should not be left in the hands of those who misuse it. If Gesenius* and Rosenmüller on the Old Testament, and Paullus on the New, are to be the guides of our students, what can we expect? Can they fail to imbibe much and irreparable evil and error from such guides as these? Let our many learned and able writers forget that there are such things in existence as compilations and abridgements, or any demand for them, and turn in good earnest to this great and all-important subject. Can they require any stronger motive for doing so, than the hope of serving the cause of GOD, by illustrating the book which contains His word, and which must form the grounds of all their comfort here, and all their hope hereafter?

* It may be important to caution the young student against many of Gesenius's most confident assertions as to the language of various parts of the Old Testament, and the inferences he draws from them as to the periods at which those parts were written. We have reason to believe that he is himself alive to this matter now, and intends to correct much in his second edition. In a business where error is so material, a second edition should not be delayed.

ART. V.—*The Life, Diary, and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale, Knight, sometime Garter Principal King of Arms; with an Appendix, containing an Account of his published Works, an Index to his manuscript Collections, Copies of Monumental Inscriptions to the Memory of the Dugdale Family, and Heraldic Grants and Pedigrees.* Edited by William Hamper, Esq. F.S.A. London. Harding, Lepard and Co. 1826. 4to. pp. 529. 2l. 2s.

THE Life of Sir William Dugdale, with which this Volume opens, was written by the great Antiquary himself, whose MS. of it is still preserved in the Ashmolean Museum. Wood, to whom it was sent soon after it was first drawn up, has indorsed it “to be published by me, with other things added, after the death of Sir William Dugdale;” but as far as we can understand the somewhat perplexed account given by the present Editor, in his introductory note, it has never, till now, appeared correctly represented from the original. There was another Life written by Sir William’s son, Sir John, the MS. of which has been lost or mislaid in the same Museum. This was intended to have been prefixed to some posthumous work of him whose Biography it related; but Archbishop Sancroft, to whose judgment the propriety of its publication was referred, having declared against it, it was not committed to the press; till Curl, whose “fell swoop” no quarry, especially if it was supposed to be forbidden, could ever escape, put forth, in 1713, what Hearne calls a faulty copy of it. This has been twice reprinted; first, by Dr. Maynard, in his edition of the *History of St. Paul’s*, in 1716, and again by Mr. Dallaway, in his *Origin and Progress of Heraldry*, 1793. When Mr. Ellis edited the *St. Paul’s*, in 1818, he preferred the Life now given once again to the Public; but he committed that sin which no Antiquary, who has one spark even of the mildest Ritsouianism in his composition, can ever forgive, (and which we ourselves cannot but think greatly diminishes the *bouquet* of Age,) he modernized the orthography;* and, moreover, he adopted some additional matter from Dr. Maynard. Mr. Hamper, in the volume before us, has been more scrupulous; he has printed faithfully from the original MS., and has disposed all the additions in notes.

William Dugdale was the only son of John Dugdale, of Shus-toke, near Coleshill, in the County of Warwick, by Elizabeth, daughter of Arthur Swynfen, a younger son of William Swynfen, of that ilk, as our Scottish neighbours would say, in the County

* A phrase in constant use, but manifestly absurd. Old spelling may be reduced to modern orthography, but this is by no means what is expressed by the phrase to which we object.

of Stafford. He was born on the 12th of September, 1605. A presage, similar to that which ushered in the nativity of Plato, marked the birth of Dugdale; there was a swarm of Bees at the time in his Father's Garden, and Anthony Wood informs us, that the "famous figure-flinger William Lilly" interpreted the omen rightly. Plato's Bees settled round his mouth, and the wise men of Athens received this incident as a prognostic of the future Philosopher's eloquence; Dugdale's did no more than swarm, and the great Astrologer declared that this "swarm did foretell that the infant should in time prove a prodigy of industry." Wood, however, is too honest to let this statement pass as a veritable prediction, and he adds, not without some archness, "but the reader is to know that the said Lilly told him, the said Will. Dugdale, so, *after most of his industry was made public.*"

His education was not very extensive. It was conducted first by a neighbouring Curate, and afterwards, till he was fifteen, at the Free School in Coventry. He then returned to his Father, (who had passed through an Academical course in St. John's College, Oxford,) and "received farther documents from him in reading Littleton's *Tenures*, and some other Law Books, and History." At his Father's desire, for such was the Oriental fashion of the times, at the early age of seventeen, he married Margery, the second daughter of John Huntbach, of Seawall, in the County of Stafford, as himself informs us, with due heraldic precision, "upon the seventeenth day of March, Anno 1622, et Jacobi Regis 20." But such perhaps was the legal wooing stuff of his time: and there is a striking parallel to his entry in an old Comedy, *Cupid's Whirligig*, acted by the children of his Majesty's Revels, in 1616. In this a Law Student addresses his Mistress as follows: "Faith, Lady, I remember the first time I saw you, was in *quadragesimo sexto* of the Queene, in a Michaelmas Term, and I think it was the morrow upon *mense Michaelis* or *crastino Animarum*, I cannot tell which."

He "tabled" with his wife's father, and "took upon him some petite employment," till the death of his own father, which occurred two years afterwards, and he then went into housekeeping for himself, at Fillongley, an estate of his own, near Shustoke; soon afterwards he purchased and resided at Blythe Hall, at which place most of his Works were written. Burton's *Description of Leicestershire* appears to have awakened in him the dormant spirit of emulation, which was readily kindled in consequence of his natural fondness for Antiquities. The neighbouring Warwickshire gentlemen were anxious for the honor of their own County, and readily afforded him access to Deeds, Evidences and Leiger Books. Through the friendship of Sir Symon Archer, of Tanworth, Knight, who was "very much affected to

Antiquities," and had "made some collections out of divers ancient writings," he paid a visit to London, and was introduced to Sir Henry Spelman, who, though nearly an Octogenarian, was still the Coryphæus of Archæologists. By him he was received with "great humanity," and the interview decided his future pursuits and fortunes. After some discourse, and looking over his collections, Spelman was so pleased with the aspirant's progress in his favourite studies that he offered to introduce him to the patronage of Thomas, Earl of Arundel, then Earl Marshal, with a view to promotion in the Office of Arms. The proposition was very agreeable to Dugdale, and was gratefully accepted. Nor was it the only advantage which he derived from his acquaintance with Spelman. Through his means he acquired the friendship of Mr. Roger Dodsworth; a gentleman whose memory, not long since, has been very playfully and amusingly revived, in a correspondence to which we need not do more than call the reader's recollection.

Roger Dodsworth was no doubt the man of most capacious Antiquarian appetite who ever inhaled a membranaceous atmosphere. From his earliest years he had commenced the task of collecting from Memorials and Records, touching the foundation of Monasteries, principally in his own County, Yorkshire, and the Northern parts of the Kingdom; and Spelman, whose declining years forbade such a partnership for himself, urgently pressed Dugdale to join with his new friend in that commendable work; unto which proposal the young man readily inclined. The alliance was formed, with a reservation on the part of Dugdale, that in entering upon the larger field, he should by no means neglect his particular collections concerning Warwickshire, in which he had already made considerable progress.

While in London, Dugdale formed many other very valuable connexions, and obtained admission to many important Libraries; among them to that of Sir Christopher Hatton, afterwards Lord Hatton, to Records in the Tower of London, and to the well-known treasures of Sir Robert Cotton. Sir Christopher Hatton seconded Spelman's recommendation to Lord Arundel so heartily, that on the 24th of September, 1638, Dugdale was created a Pursuivant at Arms extraordinary, by the title of Blanch Lyon.

In the following year he was advanced to the post of Rouge Croix Pursuivant in ordinary, which gave him a lodging in the Herald's Office, certain perquisites, and a yearly stipend of twenty pounds; but the chief benefit which he derived from it was the easy access thereby afforded to the various Records with which he had become acquainted in London. But the times, however, began to be troublous, and to show unequivocal signs

of an approaching political tempest; and Dugdale, with much sagacity, foreseeing the points at which Rebellion would chiefly level its attacks, namely, the Religion and Monarchy of the Nation, "whereby nothing less could be expected than the profanation of all places of God's public worship, destruction of monuments in Churches, and defacing whatever was beautiful and ornamental therein," lost no time in providing, as far as in him lay, a remedy against these anticipated mischiefs.

For this purpose he commenced an extensive tour, and

"in Sum̄er, a^o 1641, taking wth him one Mr. Will^m Sedgwick, a skylfull Armes-paynter, repared first to the Cathedrall of S^t Paul in the City of London, and next to the Abby-Church of Westm^r, and there making exact draughts of all the Monum^{ts} in each of them, copyed the Epitaphs, according to the very Letter: as alsoe all Armes in the Windows, or cutt in stone. And having so done, rode to Peterborow in North'tonshire, Ely, Norwich, Lincolne, Newarke upon Trent, Beverley, Suthwell, Kingston upon Hull, Yorke, Selby, Chester, Litchfeild, Tamworth, Warwick; and did the like in all those Cathedrall, Collegiate, Conventuall, and divers other Parochiall Churches, wherein any Tombes or Monum^{ts} were to be found; to the end that the memory of them, in case of that ruine then in̄inent, might be preserved for future and better times."—p. 14.

In June, 1642, he was summoned by the Royal Warrant to attend the King at York; and in the following month he was commissioned to accompany the Earl of Northampton to array and arm the County of Warwick, of which that Nobleman was Lord Lieutenant. He was then directed, in the King's name, to summon Lord Brooke, who had garrisoned the Castles of Warwick and Banbury for the Parliament; the latter was delivered up, but Warwick, being much stronger and more tenable, was retained by Sir Edward Peto, so that Dugdale proclaimed him and his adherents to be Traitors.

He appears also, in spite of the peaceful nature of his office,

“ Διὸς ἄγγελος ἦεῖ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,”

to have been personally engaged in one of those numerous petty rencounters which abound in the annals of Civil Warfare. Two companies of foot and one of dragoons had been placed in Kenilworth Castle, at that time the strongest fort in all the midland parts; alas, for the destruction which a period of less than two centuries has worked in that once magnificent pile! The power of the Rebels increasing very much in that neighbourhood, and the King fearing lest this little garrison should be straitened by a siege, resolved to bring it off, with its arms and ammunition, as privately as might be. Accordingly Sir Richard Willys was

despatched for this purpose, with two troops of horse and one of dragoons; and Dugdale, being well acquainted with the roads, was instructed to accompany the party as a guide. The service was faithfully and skilfully performed, but not without the Rebels obtaining such early knowledge of the retreat of the garrison, that they pursued and overtook the King's Troops, in Curdworth Field, two miles northward of Coleshill. Here the Royalists, although the numbers were five to one against them, made so resolute a charge, that they put their pursuers to rout, and took some of them prisoners. Dugdale had the honour of being the bearer of this agreeable intelligence to the King.

He was present also in attendance on the King at Edge Hill; the field of which Battle he afterwards exactly surveyed in company of a skilful surveyor, "noting where each Army was drawn up, how the canon placed, and the graves where the slain were buried; observing, from y^e relation of the neighbouring inhabitants, the certain number w^{ch} lay buried in each grave, w^{ch} in the whole did not amount to one thousand, though the report of the vulgar made them no less than five thousand." Subsequently he fixed himself with the Court at Oxford, where he was admitted M.A. in 1642. On the 16th of April, 1644, he was created Chester Herald; and giving himself up to the prosecution of his Antiquarian pursuits, by close inspection of the Bodleian and other Libraries, he remained, to his great content, with the exception of some occasional excursions, a resident in the University, till it was delivered up in June, 1646, by Articles in which he was included.

In London, whither he then proceeded to pay his sequestration, he again met Mr. Roger Dodsworth. That gentleman's time had been employed with equal diligence; and Dugdale, with great joy, "discovered that he had transcribed many Foundations, Charters, and other Grants of consequence, relating to the Monasteries of Yorkshire, and some other Counties, w^{ch} he copied for the most part from the originals, remayning in sundry large chests deposited in S^t Maryes Tower at Yorke." It was very fortunate that Mr. Dodsworth's researches were made in this direction, for St. Mary's Tower was accidentally blown up during the Rebellion, and the originals of the transcripts perished.

In May, 1648, Dugdale visited Paris, in which Capital he spent three months, extracting, from the collections of M. du Chesne, many things of note, touching certain Religious Houses in England, Pories-Alien, which had been Cells to great Abbies abroad—these were afterwards largely used in the *Monasticon*. On his return he directed himself once more to the Cottonian

Library, and as a *delassement*, amid his more weighty studies, he gave the following specimen of episodical diligence.

“ This being accomplisht, and discovering there many bundles of Papers of State, w^{ch} were original Letters, and other choise Memorials obtained by Sir Robert Cotton from sundry hands, some whereof were the transactions betwixt Cardinall Wolsey, Cromwell, (afterwards E. of Essex,) Secretary Paget, Cecill L^d Burley, Secretary Walsingham, and others, relating as well to forreйн as domestiq’ affaires : as also the Letters and Papers of Mary Queene of Scotts, Thomas Duke of Norfolk, and severall other eminent persons in those times ; the sayd Mr. Dugdale sorted them methodically, both as to time and otherwise, and caused them to be bound up wth clasps, and S^r Thomas Cotton’s Armes stampt in gold on each side of every booke ; all w^{ch} amounted to more than fourscore volumes ; by w^{ch} means they are now made usefull to all lovers of Historicall learning.”—p. 24.

Matter sufficient for two volumes of the *Monasticon* had now been gathered together, and the Work was offered to the Booksellers on such terms as would not have done more than repay the expense of the transcripts. The Booksellers however declined, and the compilers jointly “hyred several sumes of money to defray the cost and expence thereof,” when, unhappily, Mr. Dodsworth died, (not in Swisserland, as has been lately reported, by a fall from a glacier, but quietly in his own bed, in Lancashire,) before a tenth part of the first volume had passed through the hands of the Printer. The first volume, however, was finished in 1655 ; the second was delayed for some years, until the greater part of the impression of the first was sold off, so as to repay the expenses ; but meanwhile, before the close of 1656, Dugdale brought out his *Antiquities of Warwickshire*.

We have already mentioned his early collections relative to St. Paul’s. He now obtained access to the papers of one Mr. Reader, a deceased Northamptonshire gentleman, who had amassed Cartularies, Manuscript Books, original Charters, old Rolls, and other very ancient Writings, in Bags and Hampers, relative to that Cathedral, amounting, when Dugdale came to remove them, to no less than ten porters’ burthen. Hume is said to have turned aside with terror, from the Presses containing original documents, when they were thrown open for the use of his History ; and to have retreated in haste to the Sofa, upon which the greatest part of that brilliant work was composed ; a work which, in spite of the artillery directed against it in our own times, is not likely to be superseded as a National History, while Thucydides is preferred to Geoffry of Monmouth. Dugdale was of another temper : and having these papers in his private custody, he bestowed pains to

sort them in order, and to make extracts from them, until he had obtained all that was historical relative to the Cathedral. After the Restoration he presented them to the Dean, Dr. Barwick.

In 1660, Dugdale received the appointment of Norroy King of Arms; in 1661, he published the second volume of the *Monasticon*; in 1662, his work on *Imbanking and Drayning*; and in 1666, his *Origines Judiciales*. He assisted also to arrange the second volume of Spelman's *Provincial Councils*, and his *Glossary*; both of which had been left in a state very unfit for the Press. As a curious point in Literary History, it may be mentioned that Sir Henry Spelman offered the whole of his *Glossary* to the Booksellers, for five pounds, to be taken out in Books; and this offer was refused. He then printed at his own charge, and the greater number of copies remained on his hands after the expiration of eleven years.

Dugdale now digested the collections which, during a period of thirty years, he had been forming for a *Baronage of England*, which appeared in 1675 and 1676; towards the end of which last year, after some little disagreement between the King and the Earl Marshal, as to the patronage of the office, he was advanced to the high dignity of Garter Principal King of Arms. That the Posts which he held were not then considered as mere appendages of State pageantry, is clear from Dugdale's own record.

“As to the exercise of his Office of Norroy, when he was provincial King of Armes for the Northern parts of this Realme, the Bookes of his Visitations of the severall counties under his chardge, remaying in the Office of Armes, will sufficiently manifest his care therein; viz. by taking exact notice of all Collateralls; that is to say, Uncles, Aunts, Brothers, and Sisters, in the Descents there drawn: and publicly disclayming all such as tooke upon them the titles of Esq^r. or Gentleman wthout just right, and truly registering the Armes of all such as could shew any justifiable right thereto.

“As also in defacing such Tablets of Armes, as he found in any publiq^t places, w^{ch} were fictitious, and pulling down several Atchievements, irregularly and against the Law of Armes hung up in any Churches or Chapells, wthin the precincts of his province; the particulars whereof are exprest in that large Booke in the Office of Armes, covered wth russet Leather, and called the Earle Marshall's Booke.

“And farther to vindicate the just rights of his sayd Office, comēced a Sute at the Com^{on} Law against one Randle Holme, a paynter in the City of Chester, who had boldly invaded the Office of him the said Norroy, by preparing Atchievements for the Funerall of S^r Raphe Ashton of Middleton, in the County of Lancaster, Kn^t, and giving directions for a formall proceeding at the solemnity thereof. Whereupon he had a verdict against him the sayd Holmes, at the generall Assizes held at Stafford in March, a^o 1667, and recovered good damages, wth costs of suit.”—pp. 34, 35.

His *Account of the late Troubles* appeared in 1681; and it was his last work of any length. His labors however continued unremitted; and he was employed in correcting, arranging, and transcribing, until a severe cold terminated his long and useful life, on the 10th of February, 1685. He was interred in a stone coffin in a vault of his own construction, under the North Side of the Chancel of Shustoke Church, by the side of his wife, to whom he had been married fifty-nine years. We need scarcely remark that these concluding particulars are not recorded by his own pen, but are taken from the other MS. which once existed in the Ashmolean Museum.

This *Life* is followed by a *Diary*, written by his own hand, in a series of interleaved Almanacks, still preserved by his descendant, Dugdale Stratford Dugdale, Esq. M.P., at Merevale, in Warwickshire. It embraces the period from the beginning of 1643 to the last week of the writer's life, exclusive of the years 1654, 5, and 6; and considering the momentous events of which he was in many instances an eyewitness, it is deeply to be regretted that it consists only of meagre and scanty entries, instead of details of occurrences. But it evidently was not intended for any thing more than a hand-book, if we may so call it, to his own memory; and he little contemplated that it would ever meet the anxious and inquiring eye of a fastidious Public. Thus we are told in brief, of many incidents with which we are accustomed to connect great expectation of interest, and it is with proportionate disappointment that we find them scarcely touched upon. "1643. March 2. The Lord Brooke kild in assaultinge y^e Cathedrall Church of Litchfield." "June 18. The fight of Chalgrave, Hampden hurt." "1645. June 14. The King defeated at Naseby-field." "1649. Jan. 30. The King beheaded at the gate of Whitehall." The only farther memorandum respecting the Royal Martyrdom, occurs at the end of the Pocket book of that year.

"In consultacōn. To have had y^e K. hat taken off, and his head held up by 2 men, at his tryall. To have putt on him his robes and crowne. His head was throwne downe by him y^t tooke it up; bruis'd y^e face. His haire cut of. Souldiers dipt their swords in his blood. Base language upon his dead body.

"The Earle of Newport told D^r Taylor, y^t Mr. Calamy told him y^t he had often heard y^e Lord Brooke say y^t he hoped wth these Eyes to see y^e Kinge and y^e Church pull'd downe."—p. 96.

Some of the more personal entries are amusing specimens of the manners of the times. "1660, March 13. My daughter Lettice went towards London in Coventre Waggon." "1665. New Year's gifts, viz. from Mr. Stone of Colshill, a Sugar loafe;

Mary Sadler of Shustoke, 2 Pullets, &c. in all 17 Capons, 17 Pullets, and 8 Geese."

"The rates and prices for the Atcheivements of a Knight, wrought in Oyle.

A Standard, 4 yards long, of Crimson Taffata . . .	3	10	0
For 2 Penons, 2 yards and an halfe long, at 2. 10. 0.			
a piece	5	0	0
For a Coat of Armes	2	10	0
The Mantle of Black Velvet, w th gilt knobs . . .	1	0	0
The Helmet, gilt, w th silver and gold	1	0	0
The Crest carved and coloured in oyle	0	13	0
The Sword, w th Velvet Scabard	0	10	0
The Target, carved and gilt, in oyle	0	16	0
A Gauntlet	0	10	0
Gilt Spurs, w th velvet Spur-lethers	0	5	0"

p. 125, 126.

"Diet of 20 Dishes serv'd up to the Heralds, at St George's feast, held at Windsor, 28 Maij 1674:—

SUPPER.	SECOND COURSE.	
Sallet and Pickles, 1. s.	Pullet, gr. 3.	Manchet, fine, xj.
Veale and Capon, boyld, 1. s.	Chicken, fine, 8.	Cheat, fine, 6.
Chicken, boyld, 8.	Duckling, 6.	Cheat, coarse, 10.
Mutton, rost, 1.	Rabbets, 6.	Beare, 8 gall.
Green Geese, 3.	Lobsters, 4.	French Wine, 2 Pitchers.
Veale, 1. s.	Prawnes, 1. s.	Sack, 2 q'ts."
Capon, gr. 2.	Tart, 1.	
Lambe, d. s.	Gan'on of Bacon, 1.	
Steake pye, 1.	Tongues, 2.	
Chicken pye, 1.	Jelley, 1.	

p. 136.

Of his activity in his official duties, and his vigilance to prevent illegitimate Heraldry, we meet with frequent instances.

"1667. Feb. 11. I rode to Derby. 12. From thence to Bradley, where I pulled down and defaced those Atcheivm^{ts} w^{ch} were made and hung up by Nower, a paynter in London, for Alderman Merill.

"April 10. Thence to Middleton, (5 miles,) where I pulled down the Atcheivm^{ts} hung up by Holmes of Chester, at the funerall of S^r Raphe Ashton K^t and B^t 2^o Maij 1665, and returned to Manchester that night."—p. 126.

"1668. March 14. I puld down the Atcheivements hung up in Nether Pever Church, for Mr. Cholmley of Holford, and those in Budworth Church for Mr. Merbury of Merbury, and rode that night to S^r Peter Leicester's at Tabley.

"16. I rode thence to Biddulph in Staffordsh. and puld downe the Atcheivem^{ts} hung up for S^r John Bowyer and his Lady.

"August 7. To Chomley, to my L^d Chomley. 11. Thence to Chester, where I pulld down those Atcheivements w^{ch} Holmes, the Paynter, had set up again in S^t John's Church, for Alderman Walley; w^{ch} I tooke downe in a^o 1644. And that night I rode to Chirke in Flintshire (S^r Tho. Middleton's house) wth Mr. Chomley of Vale Royall, to view what

was hung up by Holmes, y^e Paynter, at S^r F. Middleton's funerall."—pp. 128, 129.

" 1670. August 16. To Tabley, to S^r Peter Leicester's house. 17. Dunham, to my L^d De la Meres. 18. Thence to Budworth, where I puld down and defaced those Atchivements w^{ch} Holmes, the Paynter, of Chester, had hung up again for Mr. Merbury, (w^{ch} I puld down once before.) That night I rode to Chomley, to my L^d Chomley's house.

" 19. Thence to Eston in Wyrrell, where I puld down and defac'd two penons, w^{ch} Holmes had hung up in the Church, for Mr. Poole of Poole; and that night lodg'd at Chester.

" 20. To Cholmley, to my L^d Cholmleys.

" 21. Thence to Chirke in Denbysh. where I puld down and defaced divers penons, and other Atchievements hung up by Holmes, for S^r Tho. Middleton, and his Son; and rode that night to Ellesmere."—pp. 132, 133.

The third and most interesting division of this volume consists of Correspondence. Many of the early Letters are addressed to Sir Symon Archer, of Tanworth, whom we have already mentioned among the Patrons of his youth; they are interspersed with a few from the good Knight in return, and one or two from Sir Christopher Hatton; all of them tending to show the high estimation in which Dugdale was held by both. The short extract which we shall first present, from a Letter to Sir Symon Archer, dated in May 1638, manifests the sound principle upon which Dugdale commenced his researches, by never relying upon second-hand authorities. Those who have had occasion to refer from authors even of the purest reputation, and upon whose literary integrity no stain can be cast, cannot but have remarked the frequent inaccuracies which *incuria fudit* over this portion of their labours.

" And herewth all lett me be bold to give you this caution, y^t to depend on any mens collections or transcripts wth out comparinge them wth the originalls, will but deceive you, have they bin never soe judicious. My selfe can instance and shew you by experience out of some of the laborious gatherings of Mr. Thynn, some tymes Lancaster, and Mr. Charles his successo^r, nay S^r Richard S^t George, and Glover Somrset himselfe, w^{ch} I have had recourse to, y^t there is noe trust to them; for beside a worlde of grosse mistakes in names of men and places. w^{ch} (not for want of heed) they have passed, they have here and there gleaned accordinge to their fancye, and left behinde them as materiall things as they have taken, and this I know you finde by Mr. Ferrers. For each man knowes his owne end in what he doth, but not another's; like as you see the costlyest worke in stone or tymbre not reared by him y^t framed it, is not soe good as the rough Quarryes or Tree, to him y^t shall have occasion to build therwth after his owne fashion."—p. 182.

The opening of the following Letter to Sir Symonds d'Ewes will be read with deep interest from the proximity of its date to the King's murder.

“ As this dealing towards y^e King is no doubt the great wonder of all Christendome, soe must it needes be the shame of the English Nation to this and future ages. I know full well that the great hand of God is eminently in this worke, though the inmediate causes and endes therein are not to be discerned by us, and I am noe lesse satisfied y^t all my sorrowing for it avayles him little, yet such is the frailtye of our nature that we cannot conquer ourselves in these passions as we would, and in this truly I should blame my selfe for hard heartednesse, if I did not beare a good share wth him in these his great sufferings. I now expect nothing but to heare of his death, in w^{ch} I doubt not but y^t, as in all other his afflictions he hath done, he will performe his part to admiration. And soe hourelly comēding him to God by my earnest prayers, I descend to the p^ticulars of your Letter.”—p. 218.

The conclusion, which we forbear to extract, is a striking proof of the facility with which men's minds can glance from public transactions of the greatest moment, to the consideration of matters more immediately belonging to their own private tastes and peculiar habits. Dugdale, if any man, was a true and loyal subject, and he had passed many years in close official and personal communication with his Sovereign, whose fate he sincerely lamented and plainly foresaw; and yet ten days before the close of that unhappy Prince's tragedy, he can calmly turn from the contemplation of it, to thank the “good Providence” which has put in his possession a copy of King Edgar's Laws, and to gossip with a brother Antiquary about Ælfrick's Grammar, Bale, Pits, and Leland, and a translation of the Saxon code into Latin.

Roger Dodsworth is but a dull Epistler; and no wonder, for whatever energies he might possess must have been consumed in the pertinacious unrolment of such *blattarum et tinearum epulæ* as hitherto had escaped the eyes of man. Witness his own account of himself: “I have newly received your lres, Wednesday 10 a'clocke; being new come in so weary from the Tower that I can do nothing. I am so very weary, having staid there since 8 in the morning till 9 this evening, and never stir'd out of the place to eat a bitt of bread, so that you must excuse me for all thinges till the next returne. - - - I am tyred and sleepy and can write no more.” We are assured, in a note upon this passage, that Dugdale himself was of another temperament. Anthony Wood speaks of him thus in 1667, when he visited London; “He (A. W.) found Mr. Dugdale in the office (the Record Office in the Tower) where he was to sit, who was running over a course of Rolls, in order to the drawing up and finishing either his 3d volume of *Monasticon Anglicanum*, or his *Baronage*: and so long as A. W. stayed in London, which was but a few dayes, he spent them there in his company, and at 12 of the clock every day they dined together at a Cook's house within the Tower, and

sometimes had Jennings (the searcher of the Records) a *boon blade* among them."

Dr. Gerard Langhane, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, was among Dugdale's correspondents. In returning thanks for a presentation copy of the *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, he suggests a method of advertising the work, strongly characteristic of the times, in which weekly Gazettes of Literature, monthly fly-leaves circulated with Magazines, and Quarterly Catalogues of New Publications were as yet unthought of. "I could wish you wold write to Mr. Barlow (as I have since spoke to him) that the Copy you sent for the Pub. Library (where it may deserve a place with the best) after it is bound up, may, for a quarter of a year or so, be laid in the great East window, where strangers and others this sunier may have occasion to take notice that there is such a book extant; and then I think you will not want chapmen for it."

We have already seen in the *Diary* that Dugdale was engaged in legal warfare with Randle Holme, the author of *The Academie of Armory*, a Herald Painter at Chester, for taking upon himself, contrary to the etiquette of Rouges Dragons, to marshal Sir Ralph Aston's Funeral. The parties must have been on more amicable terms when the following letter was written. It must be confessed, that the offer which it contains savours strongly of Bribery.

"HONOURED S^r,—I make bold to present y^w with these few lines in behalfe of a yonge Gentlewoman living in Chester, whom it hath pleased God to linke in affections to one of neere Relation to my selfe, but she being of an Illegi[ti]mate line it is held some disperagem^t both to her and us, for to have a Batune crosse the Coat; the family to whom she is to be joyned havinge nev' bine stained with any such. Therefore it is her and her Friends' desire, that the originall Coate of the family may be someway altered in Collours, though not in the Charge, thereby to take away all markes either of yonger houses or of Illegitimacy, and for that end I have drawne them the paternall coate and crest, onely altering some Collours, as the Leopards-head blew, w^{ch} aunciently were Greene, and the Crest blew w^{ch} was Red before; w^{ch} is conceived to be an alteration sufficient, as the roalle it selfe will further manifest. For the writing under it, it is left to y^r selfe, onely they would have as little as could be, and no mention of any thinge concerneing the Illegitimacy, but thus, or to this purpose:—This is the Coate of Tho. Aldersay of the City of Chester, Aldern⁷, which is allowed to him and his heires to beare, and is attested by, &c. Now, S^r, I have opened the cause, in the next place I must come to the reward; although it be soe, that as a freind to the Court I beleeve I might request such a favour, as being done in a manner for my selfe, yet being the first fruites of my endeavours for the advance of the Credit of the Office, I have by the enclosed letter ordered fro⁷ a freind of myne upon the first sight to pay y^w five

pounds, for w^{ch} I make no question but for my sake y^w will accomplish w^t is desired, and for the future I shall not be ungratefull for such y^r kindnesse to me, (for I do take it as to my selfe) I shall for ev' remaine,

“ S^r, Your most humble and observant Servant,

“ Chester, 11 Dec^r. 1661.

RANDLE HOLME.

“ My humble service to Sir Edw. Walker.

“ S^r, There is an Aldernⁿ sone in Chester whose great grandfather was base borne, whom I have bine treating with sev' all tymes about the alteration of his Coat, telling him for 10^{li}, and not under, it may be accomplished; five he is willing to give but not above, if y^w please to accept of that sum^e y^w may writt me a line or two. I desire y^w will send the Roll downe againe with as much speed as y^w can.”—pp. 357.

There are some curious Letters to the well-known Elias Ashmole, and his servant, Samuel Storey, too long for extraction, expressive of great perplexity regarding the preparations for a public Funeral of a Mr. Leveson. This Gentleman was only an Esquire, but as he was serving the office of High Sheriff of the County of Salop at the time of his decease, Dugdale inclined, at first, to think that he must be buried in the rank and condition of Knight, “ as the Lord Mayor of London, in case he dye in his Mayoralty, is to be buried as a Baron,” Another doubt was, whether Clarendieux or himself had the right of conducting the Funeral, (which was a matter of no small pecuniary advantage,) seeing that the body was to be interred in the Province of Clarendieux, although the demise took place, and the Funeral was to set out from Dugdale's own Province. This, afterwards, was decided in Dugdale's favour, because the place of burial was changed. Again, whether, as High Sheriff, he might not have a led horse, a *Chival-de-dule*, as he writes it. Particular injunctions are given, more than once, to the Escoccheon maker, that although he may use Sir Richard Leveson's crest, a Goat's Head issuing out of a coronet; nevertheless, he take especial care to put a collar of gules round this neck, “ otherwise the heirs at law of Sir Richard Leveson may take exception.” In the end, after all, the *Chival-de-dule* was not allowed to walk, for as the Funeral took place in Cheshire, and not in Shropshire, as at first proposed, Mr. Leveson could not be buried as High Sheriff, but only as Esquire, without the King's special warrant. It still remained in doubt whether he could be allowed a sword and target or not, and on this point we do not find the decision recorded. Dugdale appears to have been more than usually anxious for his own personal appearance on this solemnity. He urgently requests the loan “ of Mr. Ryley's gown and hood,” and to have sent him “ a payre of blacke stockings, with black garters and shoo ties.”

“ Therefore if your Master do returne before the Caryer who is to bring the Box do come out of London, w^{ch} which will be not till *Saturday*

*come sevenight, (vz^t Sep^r 7th) I pray you desire him to go into my study, and in those Drawers w^{ch} are under the Table and near to the window, he will finde in one my stockings, in another my Garters and shoo-tyes w^{ch} are black; and in another a payre of *old black Gloves*: and let them be put up wth my Coate, Gowne, and Hood.”—p. 379.*

We have not room to enter into a quarrel which unhappily occurred between Dugdale and Anthony Wood, relative to some MSS. bequeathed by Mr. Sheldon to the Herald’s Office. But from the tone of irritation manifested in Wood’s Letters we shrewdly conjecture that he was in the wrong; and from one passage in a Letter (clxxviii.) from John Dugdale to his father, a very strong suspicion arises that his passion for Antiquities had so far enamoured the otherwise honest Anthony of a large and fair Leiger Book of Glastonbury Abbey, that he actually possessed himself of these parchments to the detriment of the Herald’s Office, and in spite of the Will of the Testator.

But there are two Letters which we must extract entire; both as they contain matter of interest, and also as they prove the great esteem entertained for Dugdale, on subjects connected with Ecclesiastical affairs, by very exalted Church dignitaries of his time. The first is from Bishop Burnet, in reply to some questions proposed by Dugdale relative to certain passages in the History of the Reformation.

“SIR,—I most humbly thank you for the great favour you have done me in sending me the inclosed remarks, which I return back to you with the answer which I have writ to your Queries. I desire nothing so much as to find out Truth, and shall be very ready to confesse my mistakes as oft as any shall discover them to me. I doe esteem my selfe in a very particular manner bound ever to continue, Sir,

“Your most humble and most obliged servant,

(Probably 1681.)

G. BURNET.

(Dugdale’s Remarks and Queries.)

(Burnet’s Answers.)

HIST. OF THE REFORMATION, PART I.

p. 8.—Card. Wolsey (by whom K.H. 8. was wholly guided) affected to govern wthout Parliam^{ts}.

Qu. *Who sayeth so?*

It is evident enough from Card. Wolsey’s being Chiefe Minister 14 years without any Parl^t but one, and from the Loans and Benevolences raised in his time, that he did not love Parliaments.

p. 187.—That Edw. the Confessor founded the Priorie of Coventrie.

It was founded by Lcofric, Earle of Mercia.

I have not the Monasticon by me, but I am confident Edward the Confessor either founded or exempted Coventry; and that is enough to my purpose, for there I treat of Exemptions.

p. 223.—Bookes published to represent the crimes of the Religious Votaries.

Qu. *Where to be seen?*

p. 261.—Upon the Dissolution of the K^{ts} Templars, their lands adjudged to the L^d by Eschaet.

Not so, but to the heires of the Donors, who hold them for a time. Vide Inq. 16, E. 2, n. 70.

p. 275.—Knights Hospitalars a Guard to Pilgrims.

Not so, but to entertain them; the K^{ts} Templars being they that guarded them.

p. 312.—The L^d Cromwell (son to Thomas Earle of Essex (sunⁿ-on'd to Parl^t a^o 1542. (34 H. 8.)

He was created L^d Cromwell after his father's death.

p. 351 et 352.—Concerning suffering death for not swearing the K. Supremacy, is false you say. Yet you say in the next lines, that in y^e Parliam^t of 28 H. 8. the Subjects were required under payn of Treason to swear that the King was supream Head of the Church of England.

p. 346.—The yeare of our L^d 1547, in the margent, is mistaken: for that yeare is 1 Edw. 6.

Henricus Stephanus in his Apology for Herodote mentions those books, and quotes large passages out of them.

My L. Chancellour writ all that Paragraph, so I can say nothing concerning it.

The Hospitallers were at first of the nature of other Hospitalls, and entertained the Pilgrims; but as soon as they were made an Order of Knighthood, tho' they were still known by the name of Hospitallers, yet they conducted and guarded the Pilgrims, as well as the others did: and in particular they had Ships and Gallies for their Transportation and defence from the Pyrats, as appears by a large book written of that Order.

I understand now that the L^d Cromwell was made a Lord when his Father was made E. of Essex, and his name is mentioned in the list of the Peers of that Parl^t that attainted his Father.

More, Fisher, and the Carthusians, are generally represented to have suffered for denying the Supremacy, tho' there was no law to make that Treason then. It is true ther was a law made after they suffered, by which it was declared Treason: but then all had taken the Oath, in particular the Abbots, over and over. So that those who suffered after that were condemned either for the Rebellion in England, or for holding Correspondence with the Pope and Car. Pool, so none were put to death for denying to swear.

I alwaies begin the account of the year from the first of January.

In the Collection.

p. 142, &c.—The names of divers Monasteries mistaken.

I took the names of the Monasteries from their Resignations.

HIST. OF Y^e REFORMATION, VOL. II.

p. 6 et 7.—Noblemen designed by K. Henr. 8th to be created.

Q. *The proofe?*

Ib. p. 7.—The D. of Norfolk's desire (after his attaynder) that all his lands might be bestow'd on the Prince.

Q. *The proofe?*

p. 176. Charles Brandon, D. of Suff. his Issue by y^e Freuch Queene illegitimated.

Q. *The proofe?*

The two first particulars are taken out of the Councell book, which I gave to Sr John Nicolas.

It should be only illegitimate not illegitimated, for that imports a Sentence: but all our Scotch writters, particularly Lithington in his letter to Cecill, which is the last in the Collection of the first Volume, speak of Ch. Brandon's having a wife before he married the French Queen, who is said to have outlived her.

p. 182.—The great Scale taken from the L^d Chancelour (Rich) the cause thereof.

Q. *The proofe?*

Both Fuller and Heylin mention it, and at Leez I found the Tradition of it constant in the family. The old Earle of Warwick related it to many from whom I had it.

p. 400.—That the Papists came to Church for divers yeares in Q. Eliz. reign untill she irritated the King of Spaine, by giving Ayd to the Netherlanders against him; whereupon he prevailed wth the Pope to interdict them that came to the Liturgy of our Church, and to set up Seminaries of Jesuits in sundry places.

This Interdiction was about the 10th yeare of Q. Eliz. whereas her assisting the Netherlanders was many yeares after, as Mr. Camden, in his Annals of her reign, manifesteth.

Upon the first breaking out of the Tumults in Flanders, the Agents both of England and France endeavoured to inflame them, and England was the Sanctuary to which they retreated from the first beginnings of those warres. So tho' it was long after before the Queen did openly undertake their protection, yet from the first outbreacking the K. of Spain lookt upon the Queen as their friend, and knew that the trade would remove to England, as in effect it did, and so he studied from that time to imbroil the affaires of England.'—pp. 424—427.

The second is from Archdeacon Grenville, a son-in-law of Bishop Cosin, a high-spirited and most conscientious Clergyman,

whose name deserves to be mentioned in the same page even with that of Sancroft. While James was on the throne, Grenville opposed, to the utmost, his bigoted and unconstitutional endeavour to change the National Religion; but at the Revolution he threw up all his great preferments, (and they were no less than the Deaury of Durham, a golden Stall and Archdeaconry in the same Cathedral, and the Rectory of Sedgefield,) and preferred inviolate loyalty to a fallen, and in this instance an ungrateful, master, before these splendid possessions.

“ WORTHY S^r,—Before I had y^e Happiness and honour to meet you at Mr. Secretary Jenkin’s (when I was at Windsor) I was sufficiently assured both from yo^r Works and Report, that you were a Person of great Integrity, as well as Learning; but til that Time I did not understand you to bee (what is very hard to find even among y^e Clergy, I meane) a true Churchman, a Lover of Order and Exact Conformity, not Allowing any Liberty to exalt private Prudence above y^e Church’s.

“ This encouraged mee to Present you with a small Treatise, before I left London, of Dr. Stuart’s, concerning Bidding of Prayer, hoping that soe considerable a man as yourself might put a Helping Hand to y^e Banishing y^t Irregularity out of the King’s Chappel. And y^e same consideracon doth now again Invite mee, to Recomend unto you, as I have done to some learned Clergy, this Inclosed Paper of Quæries, touching y^e Holy Communion, humbly Beseeching you, if you can now, or hereafter, give me, or Procure for mee, any Light in all, or any, of these particulars, that you would be pleased to convey it to mee in a Line or two, Directed for Dr. Grenville, Arch-Deacon of Durham, at Durham. The occasion, S^c, whereof is this. I am informed, that his Grace, my Lord of Canterbury, hath Determined on y^e setting up a weekly Celebracon of y^e Holy Communion, according to y^e Rubrick, in the Church of Canterbury; and that my Lord Arch-Bishop of York is likewise doing y^e same in his Cathedral, and that they are both writing Letters to y^e Bishops within their Provinces, to follow their Example; a noble work of Piety, w^{ch} will prove to their everlasting Honour, and very much Facilitate Conformity in the Land, w^{ch} hath been very much wounded by the bad Example of Cathedrals, who have (for y^e most part) Authorized the Breach of Law, in omitting y^e weekly celebracon of y^e Eucharist, w^{ch} hath not been constantly celebrated on Sundayes, in any Cathedrals, but Christ-Church, Ely, and Worcester. The Revival of this Rubrick hath been very long the Burthen of my Thoughts, and it hath now Rejoyced my Soul, to understand, y^t wee are now in soe fair a probability for having this good and Pious work Re-established, w^{ch} hath been too-long neglect’d, to y^e great Decay of Devocon and Conformity. And I am now (since the Receipt of this Intelligence, concerning y^e Arch-Bishops’ seasonable zeal for God’s Worship) using some frash Indeaours to prevaile wth Mr. Deane and the Prebend^s of Durham, to Rectify this great Irregularity in our own Cathedral, and (y^e better to prevaile with them to celebrate y^e Communion weekly, w^{ch} some think a mighty work of Supercrogacon) I am forced to Trace out

y^e History of y^e Eucharist from y^e very Beginning of y^e Reforma^on, believing y^t people will cease their wonder at a weekly Celebra^on, when they are convinced that there was a *Daily Celebra^on* of y^e Sacrament established in all Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, in the Beginning, and never Abolished, but only faln to y^e Ground by the Indevo^on of y^e Age, and bee ashamed to oppose weekly Sacraments, when the Rubrick (if it be strictly examined) doth, at this very Day, suppose Daily ones. Vide Rubrick after Comⁿ.

“ Your Assistance, S^r, in this particular, would bee an extraordinary obliga^on to mee, and some other Clergy-men, who Joyn wth mee in the Address, and y^e Prosecu^on of y^e very same Design. And y^e Solu^on of these Quæries will bee of Importance, not only to our own Church here, but likewise to some others in y^e other Province, who Startle at y^e very men^on of a weekly Commuion, crying out, it is the way to make people Beleeve wee are bringing in y^e Mass. Some wise men of the Clergy of these Parts, are of opinion, y^t you are the fittest Person in England, to help mee on this Account, or at least to Recomend mee some Books or Persons who can Inform mee herein. The Books y^t I, and some others, are, at present, Turning, in order hereunto, are Heylin, Cyp. Red. and Reform. of y^e Ch. Bishop Jewel, Fox’s Martyr. Paul’s Life of Whitgift, Bishop Andrewes Life and Works, Burnet’s History of Reforma^on, Q. Eliz. and Edward y^e Sixtli’s Injunct. Goodwin’s Lives, &c. If you can Inform mee of any better Authours to make a Discovery of what I seek after, I shall heartily Thank you. I know, S^r, That y^e Disturbance w^{ch} I give you wth soe long a Letter, may seem neither prudent, nor mannerly. But I perceive you soe tenderly affected towards y^e Interest of y^e Religion established in the Church of England, that I presume on your pardon; since all that I aime at, is only the Honour of God’s Service, and the Edifica^on of my Jurisdiction; the most populous Towns whereof I do not doubt, to raise to monethly Communions, when our Cathedral (w^{ch} hath been famous for Conformity in all Things but this) is once come up to a weekly Celebra^on; w^{ch} was y^e only considerable Matter in o^r Cathedral or Diocess, w^{ch} Bishop Cosins left uncompleted. S^r, I have had a very hard Game to play, these twenty Years (w^{ch} Time I have been Arch-Deacon of Durlham) in maintaining y^e exact order w^{ch} B^{pp} Cosins set on foot here, since Argum^{ts} have been brought against mee oftentimes (no Diocess in England having kept pace wth us) from y^e Practice of y^e Generality of Eminent Clergy elsewhere, and sometime from y^e Practice of y^e very Cathedrals. In considera^on whereof you will be soe kind, I hope, to a poor feeble Ch.man, (that would faine make good that ground, w^{ch} was happily gained here by our worthy Deceased Prelate,) as to afford him a little Countenance and Assistance in those matters w^{ch} you have been conversant in, in Rela^on to B^{pp} Cosin’s notion of Conformity, w^{ch} I find very few to approve of, or understand.

It did very much rejoyce my Soul, when I Discovered among the Laity so Eminent a Champion for our Comon P^r Book, as yourself, who appear to mee very right set in all Things, and particularly in the Matter of Bidding of Prayer, the very Criterion of a true Church of

England man, Praying to God to increase y^e Number of such good Friends to y^e Interest of our Church, and Reward you and yours in an especial manner for your real Love to our Poor Despised Liturgy, I do, wth great Sincerity and Affection subscribe myself, S^r,

“ Your most Faithfull Humble Servant,

“ DENIS GRENVILLE.

“ Certaine Quæres Touching the Holy Communion.

1. How long y^e Daily Communion in Cathedrals, and other Places, (established instead of the Mass, by Edward y^e 6th vide 1st Com. P^r B^k Ed. 6th) did continue ?

2. Whether it did ever obtain in all Cathedrals ?

3. In what Arch-Bishop's Time y^t holy Practice began to bee neglected ?

4. Whether weekly Comunion on Sundayes and Holy-dayes in Cathedrals, were not observed, after y^e Daily Communion fell into Disuse ?

5. Whether some Cathedrals did not (down to our late Rebellion) stil keep up this holy Practice, in celebrating y^e Holy Communion, at least, Weekly, and w^{ch} they were ?

6. Whether there were not in Cathedrals, at least in y^e Metropolitan Churches, Comunion, on y^e Festivals as well as Sundayes, after y^e Daily Communion fell into Disuse ?”—pp. 428—432.

If we are disappointed in not finding the contents of this volume of any very great interest, it is, perhaps, because we had indulged unreasonable expectations. It is very handsomely *got up*, and it fully meets the purpose for which, most probably, it was intended; that of becoming a stock appendage, in great Libraries, to the other works of Sir William Dugdale. Thus far it will not be without its value, inasmuch as it will satisfy those who might otherwise have lamented that supposed treasures continued to be locked up in MS., that there is little or nothing worth having which had not already found its way to the Press.

ART. VI.—*Sermons, Chiefly Practical, Preached in the Parish Church of Clapham, Surrey.* By William Dealtry, B.D. F.R.S. Rector of Clapham, and of Watton, Herts; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London. Hatchard and Son. 1827. 8vo. 10s. 6d. pp. 484.

THE author of this volume is well known to the public as the laborious, faithful and zealous minister of a very populous and wealthy parish. Among the preachers of the present day, he has long held a distinguished rank: and we believe that considerable surprise and regret has been occasioned by the tardiness of his printed contributions to our homiletic divinity. A few single discourses constitute the whole of what he has given to the world

in this department of literature, previous to the present publication. It will, however, be remembered that the overpowering demands of parochial duty are, at all times, unfavourable to the labour of preparation for the press; and that this is true precisely in proportion to the readiness and fidelity with which those demands are answered. We presume that this consideration alone would be found to furnish a sufficient excuse,—if excuse were wanting,—for the late appearance of the volume before us.

In submitting it to the public, the author has yielded to the wishes of many of his hearers; and, in his selection, has been influenced by a regard to the practical tendency of the discourses in question: intimating, however, the probability of his adding, at some future time, others of a character more strictly doctrinal. (Preface, p. iii. iv.)

It is not impossible that, in hinting such a promise, the author felt that from him would be expected by some, a collection of laboured and emphatic statements, on some of the most interesting and momentous points of the Christian doctrine; and that something like disappointment would be produced by the absence of such discussions from his first publication. If there be any class of readers on whom this circumstance has inflicted any dissatisfaction, we must confess that we are by no means of the number. We are no great admirers of the popular distinction between practical and doctrinal discourses. Places and seasons undoubtedly there are in which it well becomes Christian Theology to appear, as it were, in state,—to come forth arrayed in her *whole armour* of rich and massive erudition,—and to draw from her resources, and display to public view, her most costly stores of things *both new and old*. And when she thus shows herself, it is not to be considered as an idle and ostentatious parade of opulence and her strength. It is, at all times, important that the enemies or the perverters of the truth, should know that she is on the watch: that neither moth nor rust have destroyed her treasures, or corroded the weapons of her warfare; and that thieves have not broken through nor plundered her magazines and armouries. But then she will assuredly choose the proper times and places, for this sort of solemn array. The schools of divinity, or the pulpits of our Universities, are the scenes best adapted to such exhibitions and exercises. The parish church is seldom a fit theatre for theological lectures. They would be egregiously misplaced, if delivered even to the most refined and intelligent of parochial congregations: and we cannot suppress a shrewd surmise that the ears which lust for them are, too often, itching with curiosity, instead of being intently directed towards the words of eternal life. It is no good sign when people, of whatever class

or denomination, are impatient to see how certain theological difficulties will be encountered by this preacher or by that. It is one of many proofs, that the spirit of party may sometimes usurp the mask of zeal: nay—that men may, almost unconsciously, take with them, into the church, feelings not wholly unlike those, which often crowd the theatre, or the race-course!

We should be much concerned, however, if it were inferred from these remarks, that we deprecate a volume of Doctrinal Discourses from Mr. Dealtry. It is the perfection of preaching to enforce practice doctrinally, and to explain doctrines practically. Of the former excellence we have an instance in the volume before us, and we trust that satisfactory specimens of the latter may be anticipated, in the promised publications of the author. From the present work we are led to conclude that Mr. Dealtry's views respecting sermons for the parochial pulpit coincide pretty nearly with our own; that he regards the principles and doctrines of the Gospel as elements to be combined with the whole texture of the discourse;—not always to be exhibited separately, but rather to be melted down into the very mass and substance of the composition. A truly Christian sermon might easily be distinguished from a moral essay, though it should not present a *formal and direct* exposition of any one peculiarity of the Christian scheme. The principles of Revelation are, at all times, to be assumed—to be brought forward with authority—to be used as ingredients which will give a heavenly relish to the work,—a savour of honour and immortality, which no earthly materials can impart. The doctrine may be there, just as life is in the animal fabric.

Spiritus intus alit, totosque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et *sancto* se corpore miscet.

And the preacher who thus applies the peculiar discoveries and tenets of the Gospel, applies them in a way most likely to penetrate and to transform the hearts of his hearers.

Before we proceed to notice any of these sermons in particular, it may be as well to state the general impression left on our mind by a perusal of the whole volume, as to the powers and peculiarities of the writer. In the first place, then, it must strike every reader of these discourses, that their author is remarkable for perspicuity, and (if we may use the expression) perfect transparency of style. His performance is always that of a person whose notions are masterly and distinct, who has a full command of the means of expressing them, and who seems, at all times, nearly exempt from the possibility of confusion or obscurity. It will be allowed that this is an excellence of the very highest order in all compositions of the popular kind: but in none is it more precious

than in those which are to convey momentous and necessary truths to the heart and understanding of multitudes.

Nearly allied to the above is another peculiarity which distinguishes the discourses, namely, their beautiful simplicity. Whatever pains may have been employed in the collection of materials, the mere act of composition *seems* to have cost absolutely none. There is an appearance of facility that is perfectly enviable; a lightness and freedom of hand, and a precision and truth of execution, which indicate a mind of unusual quickness, invigorated by long and incessant practice.

But the author is entitled to yet higher praise. His volume is adorned with occasional passages of singular animation and force, which indicate powers of a very elevated description. In his highest mood, however, he always retains a perfect command of himself: and the result is, that in his most impressive and vigorous exhibitions, the natural character of his writings is always preserved. In the more impassioned efforts of some authors, we often perceive a resemblance to the troubled sea, which, though frequently an object of terrific grandeur *when its waters cannot rest*, is sometimes found *to cast up mire and dirt*. No such resemblance is to be discovered in these discourses. They are uniformly clear. They are often powerful, but never turbid and tumultuous. In their most striking parts, the preacher may be described as,

“Vchemens et liquidus, puroque simillimus amni.”

There is yet another most essential and valuable quality possessed by this author in a very eminent degree, the power of judiciously analysing his text. Whatever may be the subject he takes in hand, it seems to fall at once into its appropriate divisions under his touch. It is not torn into fragments by a violent and arbitrary process. The joints which connect it are *hit* with remarkable nicety and skill; and the consequence is, that the mind of the inspired writer is displayed in all its bearings, but without the slightest appearance of capricious or fantastic application.

To these excellences is to be added another, without which the highest qualities would be worthless,—a perfect familiarity with the Scriptures, and a peculiar felicity of applying them to the illustration of doctrine, and the enforcement of practice. The fragrance of the sanctuary breathes over the whole volume.

The number of these sermons is twenty. It cannot, therefore, be expected that we should attempt to make our readers acquainted with the respective merits of each discourse. We must content ourselves with a selection of such passages as may do justice to the preacher, and invite the public to a diligent perusal of the whole.

The second sermon is on *the Omnipresence of God*. We select

from it the following passage, as a specimen of the energy with which the preacher is able to gird himself up against the hardened and remorseless sinner. Having fully insisted on the importance of this truth, even to the righteous, he proceeds thus :—

“ 2. We stated that a deep sense of this scriptural truth of the universal presence of God, is important also to the opposite class : *to those who are unacquainted with Christ as their Saviour ; to the wicked and impenitent.*

“ A vague and general admission of the doctrine is of little moment. We speak here of a serious and realizing sense of it. For want of this just impression, the hypocrite deceives himself with the delusive hope, that the specious appearance by which he imposes upon others, and perhaps also upon himself, will answer a like purpose with his Maker. It is for want of this just impression, that wickedness abounds. Where is the profligate who, when acting in direct violation of the law of God, would not be terrified at the discovery how perfectly he is under the inspection of that great and terrible Being ? And how salutary would be the apprehension thus excited ! How would he tremble at the consequences of appearing in judgment before Him to whom every thought is exposed, and who is marking every deed, for the express purpose of righteous retribution ! True, there are many hardened in their vices, many beyond the reach of argument, and capable, as it should seem, of bidding defiance to the God who made them ! But is there one who could survey what is at this moment immediately, although invisibly, around him, and not recoil at the sight ? Is there one who could behold the countenance of the Almighty flashing indignation upon the daring offender, and not shrink as into the very dust before Him ? Take the boldest transgressor who ever blasphemed the name of his Creator, and spurned at the offers of his grace ; take him in the full course of his abandoned career, while good men stand appalled and even bad men are amazed at his wickedness ; let him be rioting in all the malignant passions of that spirit of evil, who *worketh in the children of disobedience* ; yet if you could give him to see for one moment in what a condition he is, with an avenging God by his side, and the vials of His wrath ready to be poured upon his devoted head ; yes, even this shameless transgressor would here, in the land of the living, call upon the rocks and mountains, to bury him for ever from the sight of that tremendous presence ! Is the man bold because these things exist not ? He is bold only because he *sees* them not. They are indisputable and awful realities, and will one day burst upon his view in all their accumulated terrors. We affirm not that even this alarm would change the heart : *that* is the work of the Holy Spirit : but would it not lead the sinner to tremble for his sins ? Would he not cry out, *What must I do to be saved ?* And if not absolutely impenitent, would he not consider his ways, and put away the evil of his doings, and listen to the message of salvation ? Who then can state in words too strong the importance of cherishing an abiding sense of the divine presence ? How full of encouragement and consolation to them who fear

God! How replete with salutary terror to those who are under the influence of an evil heart."—pp. 32—34.

The third sermon, on *Christ the Foundation of the Church*, is a very impressive and very useful discourse. We cannot, however do more than extract from it a single passage, indicative of the sobriety of spirit by which the preacher is regulated in his interpretation of Scripture.

"In after ages, when the Son of God was just commencing His public ministry, was heard a voice from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* He had not yet encountered the temptation in the wilderness, or the contradiction of sinners against Himself; He had not yet proved by His labours and His sufferings that He was able to bear in His own person the iniquities of the world and to subdue our spiritual enemy: nevertheless, so perfectly qualified did He appear to answer the divine purpose of grace, that the Father represents Him as already tried and approved. Was there none among the hosts of heaven who might have become the foundation of a spiritual church? *Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness;* and we know nothing on this subject except as it is revealed in the holy Scriptures; but if we could distinctly perceive and understand the ways of the Almighty in this plan of salvation, we should doubtless, from the view itself, be constrained to acknowledge that there was a peculiar fitness and sufficiency in the incarnate Son of God to be the foundation of this spiritual temple, this church, which He purchased with His blood and sanctifies by His spirit:—a fitness which could not be ascribed even to the first archangel. Without presuming to say that this was the only plan, by which a building suited for the habitation of God could be erected in our sinful world, this at least the expression of the prophet will authorise us to affirm, that by ampler knowledge and clearer views we should be still further led to admire the suitableness of it for the great end to be accomplished. If in the creation of the world we perceive the glory of the Creator, on this subject especially, which involves the redemption of mankind, we should be induced to exclaim, *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!* How gloriously do the perfections of the Most High unite and harmonize in this tried foundation!—pp. 45—47.

We cannot forbear to express our cordial approbation of the caution which has withheld the author from pronouncing that the Deity could have executed his purposes of mercy towards mankind by no other means than those which he has actually adopted. The suitableness of the scheme of redemption to the exigencies of fallen man, must approve itself more fully to the understanding, in proportion as it is attentively and devoutly contemplated. But it savours of presumption, perhaps of positive impiety, to assert that the Sovereign of the universe could have accomplished his gracious design in no other way. And here we are led to observe, that little reliance can safely be placed on those argu-

ments for the essential divinity of our Lord, which are confidently derived by some from the consideration, that nothing short of omnipotence could be sufficient to sustain all the relations in which the Saviour stands towards mankind. If the Redeemer, it is said, were not omnipresent, could we be certain that he always hears our prayers? If not all-powerful, could we be assured of his unfailing ability to support and enlighten us? If less than God, how could we rely on his unchangeableness, or even on the continuation of his existence? Now it is obvious, that all such arguments as these must be unable to stand for a moment before this one simple consideration; namely, that on the supposition of the Deity being pleased to carry on the work of redemption through the agency of a created being, there could be no doubt of his ability to communicate to that being all the qualities, powers and faculties which might be requisite for such agency. All reasonings which can be produced to the contrary, must be founded on the assumption, that some incommunicable property or attribute of the Deity is absolutely indispensable to the character of a mediator between God and man; an assumption which no human, perhaps no created mind, can be entitled to make. The only safe arguments on this awful question, after all, are those which rest on an appeal to the written word. It appears that language is there used respecting the Saviour which seems utterly unintelligible, if applied to a being not essentially divine: and hence we infer the essential divinity of Jesus Christ. If, indeed, any should choose to push the conclusion further, and to say, that the Supreme God *could not* have otherwise adjusted the scheme of man's salvation, because He *has not*, (inasmuch as the *necessary* wisdom and perfection of the Deity determines Him to what is best, and makes even his very choice, in some sort, a matter of necessity,) this opinion may be just. At all events it may be harmless, so long as it is held peaceably and reverently,—so long as it breeds no controversy. But it relates to things unsearchable by human faculties; and if made a subject of debate, may betray us into doubtful and perilous disputations, which every humble-minded inquirer must wish to avoid.

In Sermon VI. on the Penitent Thief, Mr. Dealtry follows the more general opinion of the commentators in considering the word Paradise, as used by our Lord to denote

“that region of the unseen world, which is assigned as the habitation of the righteous, till the soul and body shall again be united at the general resurrection.”—p. 116.

He is of course aware that it is differently understood by Light-foot, who says,

“Our Saviour speaks in the common dialect to the capacity of the thief, viz. that he should be *in heaven* with Christ.”*

And again, in his sermon on this subject,† he observes,

“What is meant by Paradise hath been some dispute. Some not thinking it means the complete state of blessedness in heaven, but something short of it; how much short of it is not worth examining. I believe the blessed Apostle (that was rapt into the third heaven, or into Paradise; *and he makes them one and the same thing*;) would determine the question after a very different manner, and assure us, that where he heard those unutterable things, was in the highest heaven, where is the throne of God and the habitation of the blessed.”

That the Apostle, however, *makes them both one and the same thing*, is, to say the least, very questionable. But, be that as it may, our own conviction is, that our Lord had no intention to convey any information whatever as to the peculiar region or province of the unseen world, to which the penitent was about to be transferred. We agree with Lightfoot so far as to believe, that he *spoke in the common dialect, to the capacity of the thief*; in other words, that he used the term *paradise* in a loose and popular sense, just as we use the word *heaven* at this day. When a good man dies, we express our hope and our trust that he is *gone to heaven*; and this without the slightest reference to any distinction between the place of intermediate repose, and that of final bliss. In the same manner, when our Lord said to this penitent sinner, *to-day thou shalt be with me in paradise*, his design most probably was, to assure him in general terms, that, immediately after death, his portion should be with the righteous. By these remarks, we do not mean to question the doctrine that there is an intermediate state of the soul between its departure and its reunion with the body at the resurrection. But we cannot but apprehend some danger to the cause of sound exposition, from the habit of deriving *any doctrine*, too confidently and hastily, from vague and popular modes of speech.

The seventh sermon, on the Joy of the Apostles at Christ's Ascension, furnishes a remarkable instance of pithy and concentrated application of high doctrines to practical purposes.

“In conclusion we may observe,

“1. *That the ascension of our Lord is not merely an important fact in the history of redemption, but that it furnishes a lesson of practical duty.*

“The remark is just in its application to each of the great events of our Saviour's history, and is repeatedly introduced in the New Testament. Did He humble Himself in the manner of His appearing in the

* Lightfoot, Hebr. & Talm. Exerc. p. 478.

† Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 1275.

world? *Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.* Did He endure the contradiction of sinners against himself? *Consider Him, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.* Did He suffer upon the cross? *We are to be crucified with Christ, and to be dead with him.* Did He rise again from the grave? *We are to reckon ourselves as alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Has He ascended into heaven? *Set your affections on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.* Thither our desires are to follow him; thither, as our church has beautifully taught us, we are in *heart and mind to ascend, and with Him continually dwell.* Lift up your hearts then, and elevate your views above the scene immediately around you, and pursue with Christian alacrity that heavenward path which your Saviour has trod! Let others, if such be their ambition, set their affections on things below; but you have a nobler calling and a brighter hope; and the man whose treasure is in heaven, will have his heart there also."—pp. 147, 148.

To the humblest and most illiterate persons in any congregation, a few short, simple and rapid sentences like these, must convey, as it were with a sort of electric force, a world of precious scriptural instruction and exhortation. Some of the most powerful and overruling motives to holiness and elevation of soul, are here at once brought home to the mind, and fixed in the memory. If a poor man should carry away with him not a syllable of the discourse but this one paragraph, he might almost be said to retire from the church clothed in the whole armour of God!

The twelfth sermon, on the Jewish Prophet at Bethel, is luminous and instructive. The whole pith and marrow of the case, however, lies in this, that the prophet, in his perplexity, might have asked counsel of God. To this point, indeed, Mr. Dealtry has not failed to advert; and, by way of application, he adds,

"I would press this point especially upon my younger hearers, and entreat them, whenever in their progress through life another person may suggest to them to do that which the word of God had already to their own consciences prohibited, to remember the narrative of this chapter, and follow the decision of their consciences."—p. 260.

We cannot, however, help wishing that his remarks had been somewhat more expanded. We can scarcely imagine a finer opportunity than this story affords, of warning young men against too easy a compliance with the corrupt and self-indulgent maxims of deceitful brethren, in defiance or forgetfulness of the most express injunctions of Revelation.

In the fourteenth sermon, entitled, *Sowing in Tears and reaping in Joy*, we meet with an engaging specimen of the author's manner, when he speaks to the religious affections:

"Thus it is that the servant of God, from the very circumstances of

his situation, is often doomed to prosecute his religious duties, and to work out his salvation in much sorrow; but he does not for this intermit his labours; he still sows: he still bears precious seed, although he goeth forth and weepeth. The anxieties of his state destroy not his spiritual energies; they rather bring him more frequently to the throne of grace; they teach him more experimentally the necessity of a living faith; they excite him to look more earnestly at the things unseen; and, relying upon the goodness and the truth of God, to hope *even as against hope*. It is with a special view to such persons, to whatever class they may belong, that the encouragement of the text has been left upon record, *They shall reap in joy; they shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing their sheaves with them*. This forms the

“ II. Subject of consideration.

“ It is asserted concerning such persons, not merely that their grief shall be done away, but that they shall see the abundant fruit of their labours; the seed which was cast into the ground in sorrow shall yield a rich harvest. They shall reap in joy, not what they have sown, but the increase of it; they shall bring their *sheaves* with them. This promise is sometimes not without fulfilment even in this present world. How many Christians who, with a depression of mind like that of the Psalmist, have even watered their couch with their tears, have, like him, been enabled to testify, *The Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping; the Lord hath heard my supplication; the Lord will receive my prayer*. How many who, while adopting his words of affliction, *My soul is cast down within me*, have also been led, from a feeling of humble confidence in God, founded upon past experience, to say, *Why art thou cast down, O my soul, why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise Him, who is the health of my countenance and my God*. In how many instances do we find, that, before this state of probation is closed, and when that awful period is at hand, which, by bringing before us the king of terrors, would seem to give double force to existing afflictions, the light of the divine countenance appears to chase away every cloud, and to fill the heart with peculiar joy. How many a troubled and agitated spirit has then for the first time seemed to experience the full power of those heavenly consolations which banish despondency and fear, and give the assurance of victory over death and an abundant entrance into heaven! Nay, even in cases where those high consolations have been delayed to a moment when the tongue had lost its power of utterance, how often has the countenance been kindled up into heavenly expression, and the eye beamed with delight, declaring, in terms too plain to be misunderstood, that the presence of God was there, dissipating all the darkness that had hung upon the soul, illuminating the valley of death, and opening wide the portals of the world of light. And instead of regarding instances of this nature as out of the usual course of God's providence, is it not rather to be concluded that they coincide with the general plan of His dealings with mankind? Where there has been true humility, a scriptural distrust of our own character, a painful conflict with temptation, *supplication with strong crying and tears*: it is for the honour of religion itself that there should be some proof of its

consoling evidence, by imparting peace to the depressed spirit under circumstances, in which a man of the world would be thrown into absolute despair. This is to exhibit the value of religion, and the power of the gospel, and the veracity of the promises, in a way the most convincing and irresistible. It compels even scepticism itself to acknowledge, if such be the mighty influence of a near approach to the realms of immortality, upon a mind hitherto harassed by painful doubts and distressing reflections—an influence felt likewise in the immediate view of the last enemy, and while this earthly tabernacle is falling into ruins—how pure must be the felicity, how vast the happiness of the world above!”—pp. 298—301.

This is very delightful and very animating; and yet we cannot dismiss it without one brief remark. It may be reasonably doubted, after all, whether such cases as those to which the author alludes, can be safely regarded as *coinciding with the general plan of God's dealings with mankind*. There *may*, it is true, be more instances than we either know or suspect, in which the light of His countenance may be but partially and scantily vouchsafed, till the shadows of death are gathering round the temples of the Christian. But it will scarcely be denied, that the essential and solid comforts of religion, both in life and death, are *usually* proportioned to the steadiness and fidelity with which religion is cultivated. In a certain sense, indeed, it may be averred, that cases of the above description fall within the current of Divine Providence; for the notion of Divine Providence may be regarded as embracing every possible mode of administration by which the government of the world is carried on. Of Providence, thus largely considered, variety, and not uniformity, seems to be one grand characteristic; and among the manifold and diversified methods of dealing with the souls of men, that which the author has described above with such beauty and felicity, may unquestionably be one. It is therefore, of course, a fit and worthy subject of devout meditation. But we have considerable doubts as to the wisdom or expediency of presenting this sort of *experience*, (if we may venture on the term,) as something which may be expected to occur in the ordinary course of things.

From the sixteenth sermon, *On the Resurrection of the Just*, we select the opening, which is eminently solemn and impressive:

“To a mind which is disposed to serious meditation, how many subjects of deep interest are suggested by the condition and destiny of man! If we look back for a few years, not one of the many millions, who at this day inhabit the earth, had been called into being: the world was to us as if it existed not; and after the lapse of a very few years, another race will have succeeded, and we shall have passed into that invisible region to which so many generations had been carried before us. While we look upon the scene around us, it is every day changing before

our eyes: many of those with whom we have formerly taken counsel together, and some perhaps who were most dear to our affections, have now gone to the house appointed for all living. And what then has become of them? Has the principle of life been destroyed with the corruptible body? Has the body itself perished in the grave? and is nothing left for us but to contemplate with sad, or even hopeless forebodings, the dark night of futurity? The gospel invites us to better contemplations: it rolls back that thick mist which hangs over the tomb, and tells of life and immortality in the regions beyond it. It bids us extend our views to the day which is emphatically called *the day of the Lord*: it points out to us the Son of God descending in the clouds of heaven, and exhibits to us the glorious spectacle of *them which sleep in Jesus*, as they are summoned from their graves and assembled before Him. It gives the assurance that of those who have departed in the faith of Christ, and those who, possessing the same faith, are alive at the period of this mighty consummation, not one shall be wanting: they shall all *meet their Lord in the air*, and shall *from that moment be with Him for ever.*"—pp. 332—334.

In commenting on the text of the seventeenth sermon, (Psalm lxxviii. 17, 18.) the preacher appears to have found a sense of one phrase which, we are persuaded, never was in the mind of the inspired writer.

"He (the Messiah) entered into heaven not as a Mediator only, but as a victorious sovereign: *Thou hast led captivity captive*; that is, Thou hast brought into subjection to thyself those who had been hitherto in bondage: thou hast rescued them from their servile state, and hast made them the happy subjects of thy just authority: thou hast broken the yoke from their necks, and hast subjected for ever the enemies who oppressed them."—p. 358.

We have no doubt that Mr. Dealtry will perceive, on reconsidering the passage, that he has given to the expression, *thou hast led captivity captive*, a somewhat more emphatic meaning than it will bear. The Messiah is doubtless here spoken of as a victorious sovereign; and, like other conquerors, he is represented as triumphantly leading into captivity a train of captives; that is, a multitude of the enemy whom he had made prisoners of war. That such is the import of the phrase, may be seen by reference to Judges, v. 12. *Arise, Barak, and lead thy captivity captive*: (ἀιχμαλώτισον ἀιχμαλωσίαν σε. Septuag.) where there can be no doubt that "*thy captivity*" signifies nothing more than, *the crowd of captives whom thou hast taken.** In the sixty-eighth Psalm, v. 18. and in Ephes. iv. 8. the expression is essentially the same. The simple meaning of the passage is, that the Messiah went up with all the attributes and circumstances of

* See, also, Numb. xxxi. 12. 19; 1 Maccab. ix. 70. 72; Apocal. xiii. 10.

victory: and if the word *captivity*, or *ἀρχμαλωσία*, is to be considered as having any particular reference, it must be to the adversaries, whom the Redeemer had disarmed and bound,—not to the multitudes whom he had released from bondage, and transferred to his own dominion and allegiance.

We cannot, in common justice, omit the latter portion of the eighteenth sermon, on Levit. x. 3. which may be produced as a very bright specimen of pulpit eloquence. The extract is long, but will, we trust, be found most amply to justify the space we have assigned to it.

“ But why do I speak of David or St. Paul? They show us but imperfectly the way in which God is to be sanctified; after all their attainments in spiritual knowledge, and all the manifestations vouchsafed to them of the majesty and holiness of God, they were still only as in the outward courts of that temple within which His glory is enshrined, and were longing ardently for larger views, and more abundant revelations. Would you see how the Lord ought to be sanctified? let then the curtain be drawn aside, which hides the view of the most holy place: let us go within the veil; let us follow the enraptured prophet to contemplate the visions of God; and what do we behold there among the sons of light, the pure spirits of immortality? The *Lord sitting upon His throne, high and lifted up, and His train filling the temple; above it standing the seraphim, the burning ones, each having six wings; with twain covering their faces, as unable to look upon the brightness which surrounded the throne, and filled with reverential awe in the presence of their God; and with twain covering their feet, to denote the depth of their humility, and their unworthiness to be employed in His service; and with twain flying, thus proclaiming their readiness to obey Him. And one crieth unto another and saith, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.* And is it thus then, ye sons of light, that elevated as ye are above the condition of humanity, uncontaminated by sin, unassailed by temptation, unredeemed by the blood of the eternal Son of the Father,—is it thus that ye veil your faces before the glory of the divine presence, and attest your humility, and declare your obedience, and extol the holiness of the Most High? What then should be the depth of that reverence, and the nature of that adoration with which we, the guilty offspring of transgression, with subjects for gratitude and love which angels feel not, and cannot feel, should come nigh unto the Lord! When we can say that *Christ hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and of enemies and aliens hath made us KINGS AND PRIESTS UNTO GOD;* how should our adoration take if possible a yet higher tone than theirs, and the voices of the seraphim themselves be lost in the louder praises of the ransomed and the redeemed of the Lamb!

“ There is, with careless and unreflecting minds, an easy way of avoiding all conclusions which tend to the enforcement of a holy life, or to the demand of holy worship, by setting forth the conditions and circumstances of men upon earth. ‘You make no allowance,’ it is said,

' for human infirmities and the necessarily distracting cares and occupations of this world's pursuits, or you would never expect that man is to conduct himself in any respect here as he will among the inhabitants of heaven, when his views will be enlarged and his faculties refined, and his soul purified from the dross of earthly contaminations. What resemblance can there be between the people of this world and the inhabitants of the world of light?

" In reply to such observations we would state, that while we admit to the full extent the infirmities of human nature, and not only acknowledge but contend that this life is a scene of probation, and that, so long as we continue upon earth, we shall never be perfect like the inhabitants of heaven, yet is it incumbent upon each of us to cultivate as much as possible the spirit and the dispositions to be found in those pure and peaceful regions: and no reasoning, grounded upon human infirmities or human trials, with a view to qualify the duty which we owe to the Almighty, or to defend any mode of worship which does not sanctify God in them that come nigh Him, will bear the test of fair examination. When we hear a good man under the Old Testament dispensation, or a true Christian in later days, speaking of his trials and his weakness, we know that his language is consistent with the purest spirit of devotion, and the most sincere dedication of himself to the service of God; and that while it denotes his own deep humility, it implies also an ardent aspiration after views more exalted, and affections more heavenly, and worship more worthy of the Lord; but to plead the infirmities of our nature, or the concerns of this life, as an excuse for coming nigh to God with cold hearts and wandering desires, and unhumiliated and irreverent dispositions, is to set aside every conclusion of sound reason.

" If we acknowledge the power and holiness of the Supreme Being, and consider the relation which we bear to Him, is it possible, we may ask, that we can be too devoted in our services, too fervent in our prayers, too earnest in our praises? The question is not whether our hearts can burn with holy love like the seraphim, or our lips, like those of the prophet, can be touched as with a live coal from the altar; but whether, upon the plainest principles of duty, it is not incumbent upon us to summon to the service of God all the powers of the mind, and to dedicate to Him those *bodies and spirits which are His*? Has God said, and that not merely in the way of peremptory command, but because His holy nature absolutely requires it, *I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me*; and are we to delude ourselves with the notion that the worship of the heart is of little moment in His sight, or that He will accept of an inferior oblation? Whence is it, my brethren, that the service of our Creator, that sacred employment of the hallowed courts of the Lord, which seems to bring together in the common sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving the whole family of His household, both in heaven and in earth, should with so many of us amount to little more than a service of compliment, without any exercise of faith, any warmth of love, any aspirations of affectionate desire towards that high and holy One whose name we invoke, and to whom we proffer our allegiance? Whence is it that the soul, which was created in the image of God, and

which once delighted to converse with him, and which, when refreshed and invigorated by the life-giving air from the mercy-seat, becomes endowed with new energies, and can mount up with wings as an eagle, so often appears as with pinions flagging and broken, weak-hearted, spiritless, faint, with no tendencies heavenward, no delight in the fellowship of the saints, no thirst for divine communications, no pleasure in meditation on the things of God; contented, as it should seem, to merge the realities of the spiritual life in a routine of ordinances and forms, in themselves a dead letter if unaccompanied by grace and power from on high? Whence is it in all cases where God is not sanctified in them that come nigh Him, that to such persons the worship is unblest? Is it not because there is wanting the preparation of the heart? Is it not because men go to the house of God without having qualified themselves to profit by the ordinance, and especially without serious meditation upon the holiness of Him to whom they profess to offer up their petitions? Would an earthly potentate consider himself honoured by the civil professions of men whose whole conduct declared that they had little respect for his person, and little regard for his authority? And is it with such hollow and unmeaning ceremony that we treat Him who is the *blessed and only Potentate*, the Creator, Preserver, and Judge of the world? Can this be the import of the solemn declaration, *I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me?*

“Whether we contemplate the character of Almighty God, the precepts which He has given for our observance, or the example of saints and angels, they all urge upon us the duty of meeting Him in the institutions of His worship with the deepest reverence, and the most active devotion of every faculty of the soul. May the spirit thus inculcated, and thus set before us, be universal in the assemblies of His people! May the ministers of Christ present before God no other fire than that which they have taken from the altar! May the people be filled with a due sense of His holiness and majesty, and come near Him by the mediation of His Son, through faith in His name, with those dispositions of reverence and godly fear, which the visible symbols of His presence could not fail to inspire! For be it impressed upon every heart which is capable of being moved by a sense of the divine presence, that God marks all the wanderings of our minds, and hears every sigh of the contrite, and observes every heavenward affection, and that through the intercession of Him who made atonement for transgressors, He reveals His loving-kindness to them that fear Him: on these He confers benefits according to the sure testimony of His holy word, even with prodigality of blessing; such is the favour with which he regards the spirit of reverential fear, that the sacred writers seem almost at a loss for expressions to describe it in all its fulness, and all its variety of application. *The secret of the Lord*, they tell us, *is with them that fear him. The eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him: His angel encampeth round about them that fear him: The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him: He will fulfil the desire of them that fear Him: His salvation is nigh them that fear Him.* Is it thus with His people on this earth? What then will be the manifestations of His

love, when, beholding Him in the majesty of His perfections, they sanctify Him with that entire devotion, and those nobler ascriptions of praise which belong to the world of glory? In this life it is needful that we be stimulated by motives of fear as well as of higher principles: there is the end of Nadab and Abihu to show that God is jealous of His honour, and will avenge the breach of it: but the people of that world have holiness inscribed upon their hearts. To be reminded of His majesty they need not, for they ever behold Him upon His throne: to be reminded of His purity they need not, for in that region all is pure: to be told of the relation in which he stands to them they need not, for this is the subject of their ceaseless song; and His love is in place of every lower consideration to stimulate them to heavenly musings, filling them with a delight suited to the nobler faculties and capacities of their heavenly natures, as they walk through the boundless fields of their blessed meditations.

“Such too in its nature, though lower in degree, is the character of our service on earth! May the Spirit of that Saviour, by whom alone we have the liberty of access to God, purify our minds, and qualify us to worship Him in the beauty of holiness! So may we bow with reverence in His holy temple! So may we sanctify Him in all His ordinances below, till we are translated into that place where every thought and every feeling is in unison with His glorious perfections, and joy and bliss shall be our portion for ever.”—pp. 387—396.

We now take leave of Mr. Dealtry for the present, with sentiments of deep respect for the qualities both of heart and head which this volume discloses. We cannot, however, part with him without expressing a lurking surmise that he has not yet put forth all his power. If we were cross-examined as to our reasons for this notion, we should, perhaps, be grievously puzzled to produce them. All we can say is, that such is the impression with which we have risen from the perusal of these discourses. And if this suspicion be well-founded, if it be true that he has ever “checked his thunder in mid volley,” we have only to entreat, that when he appears again before the public, he will cast aside all fears and scruples, that he will gird on all his might, and display all his resources. We recommend to him this entire freedom of speech, because we apprehend that we may do so with perfect safety. The “dicendi quodcumque animo fragrante liberet, simplicitas,” is not, we trust, likely to betray him into any extravagance of which he will have occasion to repent. His mind appears to be well regulated and happily balanced: and the present performance warrants us in believing that he may be fearless of peril or failure in the most ardent and prodigal devotion of his powers to the inculcation of divine truth. When a man is writing controversy, indeed, it behoves him to be on the watch against the *strange fire* and dangerous combustion of those worldly ele-

ments, which will often mix themselves with holier views and feelings. Even when he is engaged in enforcing Christian obligations, and enlarging on Christian principles and motives, his zeal may be so intense as to consume and dissipate all the more solid and useful qualities of the mind, if its original fabric be not tolerably durable and substantial. But Mr. Dealtry is not an angry polemic, nor a wild and feeble enthusiast. He may therefore safely venture to trust himself to the impulses of his heart, and to the dictates of his understanding. He may surrender himself boldly to that inspiration which awaits the humble, but fervent spirit, both in consulting and in delivering the oracles of God.

ART. VII.—*On the Historical Types contained in the Old Testament. Twenty Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge in the Year 1826, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Hulse.* By the Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Catharine Hall. 8vo. pp. 436. Deighton, Cambridge; Rivingtons, London. 12s.

THE importance of the typical interpretation of Scripture is too frequently overlooked. We ought to be upon our guard against yielding to an unjust prejudice which has often been excited against it, as being a fanciful and uncertain means of exposition, and a ground of faith altogether untenable. The just reputation for severe and accurate reasoning attaching to some writers who have distinguished themselves in exposing many *abuses* of this mode of interpretation, and in reducing it within those limits which the inspired writers appear to have assigned, has caused others to set forth pretensions to superior acumen, by a general and sweeping condemnation of the mystical sense of Scripture.

A fair field for these pretenders to exercise their sarcasms, is presented by the many fanciful expositions which have emanated from the enthusiastic and ingenious advocates of erroneous theories. But even though the imaginations of indiscreet expositors should be as multiform and pliable as the clouds before the accommodating vision of Polonius, still this would form no rational ground of objection against the legitimate, guarded, and *authorized* application of typical interpretation; it would be merely an argument from the abuse against the use. The bias of the theorist and the eccentricities of the visionary may surely be avoided, without passing over to the cold and arrogant dogmatism of the Socinian, or joining in the sneers and scoffs of the infidel.

Though we may turn with contempt from the outrageous frivolities of the Rabbies, or incredulously shake our heads as we rise from the ingenious, and often even sublime, speculations of their

justly celebrated countryman Philo, yet we cannot thence conclude that there were *no* mystical passages in their Scriptures. In fact, we may derive a strong presumption from this notorious and prevalent propensity of theirs, that there were such passages, and that their acquaintance with this *design* of their Scriptures was the source from which, by *abuse*, their erroneous practice originally took its rise. That this kind of interpretation was peculiarly adapted to the genius of the people, and that it was universally received by them, is unquestionable; and no less clear is it that the inspired writers of the New Testament, instead of denying this character to the Old, decidedly maintain it, and employ it as the *basis of their reasonings* when endeavouring to confirm the faith of their Jewish converts, or to convince their unbelieving countrymen.

It is not, therefore, because the Jews have been betrayed into excess by following the unauthorized dictates of their own imaginations, or because various Christians, from the days of Origen to those of Hutchinson, have indulged in an intemperate license of mystical interpretation, unsanctioned by the Bible, that we are to abandon to the scoffer that method of unfolding the sense of Scripture which has the stamp of inspiration, which was practised by the Apostles, and which in the various parts of the Bible exhibits to the believer those sublime and unquestionable vestiges of the Deity—the stupendous concatenation of the past, the present, and the future—the operations of uncontrolable power—the plans of infinite wisdom and knowledge.

“The importance then” (to use the words of Bishop Van Mildert*) “of figurative and mystical interpretation can hardly be called in question. The entire neglect of it must, in many cases, greatly vitiate expositions, however otherwise valuable for their erudition and judgment. In explaining the prophetic writings and the Mosaic ordinances, this defect will be most striking, since, in consequence of it, not only the spirit and force of many passages will almost wholly evaporate, but erroneous conceptions may be formed of their real purport and intention.”

From these preliminary observations on the importance of the subject to which Mr. Chevallier's *Hulsean Lectures* are devoted, we shall now proceed to lay before our readers some account of the design and character of his work.

The principal point which he has in view is to treat of the historical types of the Old Testament.

“The general view,” he observes, “of typical prefiguration is similar to that pointed out in the fourth and sixth books of Warburton's *Divine Legation*, and in Macknight's Eighth Essay, inserted in his translation of the *Epistles*.”

* Bampton Lectures.

The latter of these two writers appears to have been the one principally before him, as, with the exception of some remarks in the introductory lectures, and in treating of the sacrifice of Isaac, in which he seems to have the arguments of Warburton in his mind, we think we generally trace Macknight as his favourite author, and, indeed, as the source from which, together with Bishop Chandler's *Defence*, &c., he chiefly selects his *outline* of the different examples chosen to illustrate his positions. Not that we mean to intimate that he is a mere servile copyist, for he not only expands the several subjects, and brings to bear upon them considerable stores of scriptural reading, but also abounds in original remarks and ingenious illustrations.

The points to which he would draw his arguments and examples shall be set before the reader in his own language, and the extract will exhibit a good specimen of his style and reasoning.

“The spirit of God has adopted a variety of means to indicate his perfect fore-knowledge of all events, and his power to control them. This is sometimes declared by express verbal prophecy; sometimes by specific actions performed by divine command; and sometimes by those peculiar events in the lives of individuals, and the history or religious observances of the Israelites, which were caused to bear a designed reference to some parts of the Gospel history. The main point in an inquiry into these historical types, is to establish the fact of a preconcerted connexion between the two series of events. No similarity, in itself, is sufficient to prove such a correspondence. Hence all those alleged types have been omitted, however probable, which are not mentioned, directly or indirectly, in the Holy Scriptures. Even those recorded in Scripture are recorded under very different circumstances. If the first event be declared to be typical at the time when it occurs, and the second event correspond with the prediction so delivered, there can be no doubt that the correspondence was *designed*. If, before the occurrence of the second event, there be delivered a distinct prophecy that it will happen, and will correspond with some previous event, the fulfilment of the prophecy furnishes an intrinsic proof that the person who gave it spake by Divine inspiration. It may not from this fact follow, that the two events were connected by a design formed before either of them occurred; but it certainly does follow that the second event, in some measure, had respect to the first, and that whatever degree of connexion was by such a prophet assumed to exist, did really exist. If, again, no specific declaration be made respecting the typical character of any event or person until after the second event has occurred, which is *then* declared to have been prefigured, the fact of preconcerted connexion will rest solely upon the authority of the person who advances the assertion. But if we know from other sources, that his words are the words of truth, our only inquiry will be, if he either distinctly asserts, or plainly infers, the existence of a designed correspondence.”—pp. 423—425.

In the first lecture the author sets forth a “general statement

of the argument drawn from the historical types contained in the Old Testament." He considers types as "a collateral branch of proof by which it seems possible to confirm the divine authority of the Scriptures." He observes that

"the historical authenticity of the Old and New Testament can be established each by a separate proof;—that between the events recorded in the two books there exists a close and avowedly preconcerted connexion;—that the Old Testament throughout plainly prefigures the New, and is declared to do so."—p. 3. "Now," he concludes, "by whatever means we satisfy ourselves that this studied relation exists, the connexion, if once established, affords a proof of design in the events, and of inspiration in the volumes which record them, and found their claim to inspiration upon such a connexion."—p. 4.

He considers the proof derivable from this typical relation as independent of verbal prophecy and of miracles. There is, indeed, in this kind of proof a peculiarity, which Mr. Chevallier has justly pointed out as an important advantage belonging to it.

"It is a conceivable supposition, and it has been asserted, that a direct prophecy might be interpolated;" but the "prefigurations of the Gospel dispensation never could have been fraudulently *inserted*. They are woven into the very texture of the narrative, and can be detached by no force but such as is sufficient to destroy the whole."—p. 4.

The remainder of this lecture is employed in general, and somewhat desultory, remarks upon the subject of typical interpretation.

The second lecture, of which the title is, "*The Connexion between the Interpretation of Scripture generally and that of the Historical Types*," touches upon the beaten subject of the mode in which man, in the earlier stages of his history, communicated his ideas, and the predilection, not to say necessity, which hence naturally arose for figurative terms and description by action. It is a subject which opens a wide range for conjecture, and we do not find that Mr. Chevallier has been enabled to throw any additional light on the arguments respectively advanced by Warburton, Magee, Macknight, and others.

In his third lecture he comes to ground on which we find a more sure footing. It is entitled, "*The Use of Historical Types authorized by Scripture; the Degree of Assurance which may be expected; the Danger of Abuse, and Rules of Interpretation*."

The lecture presents a very meagre treatise on the several points enumerated in the title. The first subject, indeed, is sufficiently plain; and after the unquestionable examples of the "use of historical types," which he produces from the Epistle to the Hebrews, no reasonable man can dispute his conclusion, that, "undoubtedly, there is found in the whole of this epistle an unhesitating boldness in referring the historical types to their antitypes, which

nothing but the authority of inspiration can justify; and that interpreter would be worse than injudicious, who should presumptuously endeavour to found an argument upon any alleged similarities of a kindred nature, which his unassisted imagination might discover in the sacred volume. But he who presumes to deny the existence of all preconceived connexion between the history and ritual institutions of the Jews and the economy of the Gospel, acts a still more unwarrantable part."—p. 38.

On the other three points set forth in this title, Mr. Chevallier's remarks are not very important. The last, in particular, the "*rules of interpretation*," seems to have been almost lost sight of, and this is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Glassius, Pfeiffer, Waterlaud, Outram, and Marsh, whose works the author has consulted, present him with abundant materials, from which he might easily have digested a concise summary of rules in a very few words. Whether a repugnance to take this beaten path swayed Mr. Chevallier or not, we cannot determine; but we certainly think the substitution of the disjointed and indistinct notices which are classed under this part of his lecture, are very far from being an improvement, even upon the most trite set of rules which could have been given.

The fourth and last of the introductory lectures is much more valuable and interesting. It is entitled, "*Division of the Types*."

I. "The first division," he says, "will contain those which are the most nearly connected with verbal prophecy: those, if any, which were declared to be prophetic at the time the type was represented, or at any other period previous to the appearance of the antitype."—p. 60.

He mentions two persons, namely, "Moses, and Joshua the High Priest, in company with his fellows, as recorded in the book of Zacharias the Prophet." These he considers as the only persons who, "during their lives, were declared to prefigure the events which should occur in the Christian dispensation."—p. 61. And under this head he observes, that "the fulfilment of prophecy establishes also more indirectly the claim of other persons to the character of historical types." He instances the prophecy of David of an eternal priest, after the order of Melchisedec; and those prophecies which appear immediately to allude to David or Solomon, but in the New Testament are applied to Christ.

II. "The second division of types," he states, "will contain those which, although *not prophetic in the type*, nor ratified by any subsequent prediction, were stamped as authentic by the seal of completed prophecy in him who professed to be the antitype.

"The history of the Old Testament records some particular fact, without expressly stating that it had a designed reference to anything which should hereafter happen. The history of the New Testament records the application which Jesus Christ made of this fact to himself during his ministry upon earth. But the application is made by Christ

to some *future* event, entirely independent of his own will, and afterwards accurately fulfilled.

“If this be established, it forms an intrinsic proof of preconcerted connexion in the events, as well as of fore-knowledge in the person of Jesus.”—pp. 64, 65.

The examples of this adduced are, (1,) the brazen serpent; (2,) the reference to the Manna in John, vi. 49—51; (3,) the paschal lamb; (4,) the restoration of Jonah from the belly of the fish. Of these examples we think the second is much too doubtful to be relied upon as a case belonging to this division.

III. The two preceding classes of types are themselves, in their fulfilment, proofs of the authenticity of Scripture, and establish an authority upon which depend Mr. Chevallier's *third division of historical types*. These are such as

“are not supported by the aid of verbal prophecy, either in the type, or in the antitype; such as are declared to be types, either by express assertion, or by implicit allusion, after the events have occurred which they were ordained to prefigure. The connexion is established solely on the authority of revelation, the existence of that revelation being founded on previous proof.”—p. 70.

Of this class an example is seen in the typical sense attributed, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the Levitical sacrifices.

IV. His *fourth division* of types, depending solely on the very precarious ground of *similarity*, need only be mentioned, as they form no part of his intended discussion.

The two first of these divisions contain the points which may be said to form the distinguishing characters of our author's work, and to call forth the most valuable and interesting portion of his remarks. Both these and his subsequent illustrations of them in his several lectures, well deserve the attention of the public. The ordinary reader, when he sees an event related in the Old Testament, and subsequently cited in its typical application to Christ, either by Christ himself, or by an inspired writer of the Old or New Testament, is apt very frequently to overlook the strong confirmation of his faith, or the *distinct* proof of the authority of the Bible, presented by this adaptation. If he be a believer, he thinks the resemblance striking, or not, as the case may be; and, perhaps, he turns to the narrative in which the event originally occurs, and there finds, not only no intimation of such typical application being *designed*, but that in the primary meaning of the words the event clearly relates to the actions of a person who is the immediate subject of the narrative. Under these circumstances he receives the typical interpretation of it with humility, but not with that degree of assurance which he is entitled to derive from it. An unbeliever under similar circumstances scoffs

at it, as an unauthorized application, at variance with the design of the history, and not warranted by the plain sense of the terms used. But if these parties will attend to the circumstance of the typical application of the passage being made *antecedently* to its accomplishment in the antitype—at a time when such accomplishment could not be either anticipated by the *ordinary prescience*, or effected by the ordinary power of the person so applying it—if it be professedly a *prophetic* application, and shall be afterwards found in a wonderful and unexpected manner to correspond with the circumstances of the antitype—then the whole complexion of the matter is changed; it becomes no longer possible to contemplate it as an accidental coincidence, or as an arbitrary accommodation, but as a preconcerted and designed conformity, establishing beyond all reasonable doubt the inspiration of the person who declares its typical character, and the divine intention and interposition in predisposing the circumstances of the type, and planning their prefiguration of the antitype.

These four lectures, particularly the last, sketch out the positions which the subsequent lectures are designed to establish and illustrate. Our limits will preclude anything more than a cursory notice of the execution of this latter part of his plan.

The fifth and three following lectures are employed in proving that Christ is described as prefigured by Moses in the well-known passage* wherein God promises to raise up “*a prophet like unto*” Moses.

Mr. Chevallier, from a comparison of Exodus, xx. 19. with Deuteronomy, v. 27. and xviii. 16, determines that this promise “was evidently first made to Moses at the solemn delivery of the law upon Mount Sinai, although the prediction was not published to the people of Israel till forty years afterwards;” and he infers, that during this period the Great Lawgiver, in his several actions, “was *conscious* that he bore a typical character.” The inference is by no means destitute of strong probability, though it may admit of some question. But whether this were so or not, the declaration of his typical character was given and recorded during the life of Moses. It was distinctly stated, that a prophet was to arise at some future period like unto him; and the parallel drawn by Mr. Chevallier between Moses and Christ, establishes beyond all question who that prophet was. Some of his reasonings on this head are very striking and ingenious; we would instance the case of Moses praying that his name “might be blotted from the book of life.”—pp. 158, 159. He places on most other points the resemblance in so clear a light, and exhibits so many and so remarkable affinities, that the relation be-

* Deut. xviii. 15.

tween the type and the antitype must be manifest to any who will impartially compare them. Indeed the defect observable in this portion of his work, is a redundancy of proof upon a point which is neither new, nor generally questioned. We think he rather weakens the force of his argument, by carrying his reader into minute, and sometimes precarious points, where the principal features are abundantly sufficient to establish the connexion. As Mr. Davison well observes,

“the great and essential characters of similitude between Christ and Moses, are in the fulness and luminous intuition of their communications with God; the magnitude of the revelations made; and the institution of a religion founded upon those revelations. In these points none of the other prophets were like to Moses; and in these Moses is like to Christ as the less to his greater.”

The ninth lecture discusses the case of Joshua the son of Joseph, mentioned by Zachariah, and does not present any very material points of difference from Chandler's elucidation of the same subject.

These lectures embrace Mr. Chevallier's reasonings on the two cases which he considers as the only examples of those types “which are declared to be prophetic at the time the type was represented.” He has skilfully shown their importance, and their bearing upon his theory.

In the tenth lecture he examines the prophecies relating to David and Solomon, to which he refers as connected with his first division, and as establishing, by their *fulfilment in the person of Christ*, “more indirectly” the claim of these two remarkable individuals to the character of historical types. He observes, and it is an observation which should be borne in mind, that “double prophecy arises, not from an extension of the use of words, but from a real correspondence between the things signified; and it is closely connected with historical type and antitype.”

The same prophecy may refer to the *corresponding* actions of two different persons, of whom one was designed to prefigure the other, without rendering the words used liable to the imputation of ambiguity. The claims of David and Solomon to a typical character, he states to rest upon a principle which we shall exhibit in his own words. We

“argue from the actual existence of a prophecy, which we know, upon divine authority, to have reference to two persons, that these two were intended to typify one another. But knowing that such prefigurations have, in the course of God's providence, existed, if we find any the same two persons continually brought together by the bond of prophecy, so that the same predictions fulfilled by one, are shown in Scripture to have been fulfilled, either wholly or in part, by the other, we shall have a

strong presumption, if not a perfect proof, that the first of these persons was designedly intended to fore-shadow the other."—pp. 199, 200.

He fully establishes his theory by a variety of passages which he compares with their parallels and their interpretation in the New Testament. Few, indeed, would be predisposed to resist his conclusions; they bring to our recollections, and impress on our minds, some of the most touching beauties of scriptural composition.

We now come to the cases which Mr. Chevallier selects to illustrate the characteristic principle of his *second division* of historical types, and which are severally discussed in the eleventh and in the three succeeding lectures. In his remarks upon the brazen serpent, and on the prophet Jonah, particularly on the former, his arguments are well put, and convincing. In the typical application of the Manna we doubt, as we have already observed, the conclusiveness of the reasoning, by which this is inferred to be a type "stamped as authentic by the seal of *completed prophecy* in him who professed to be the antitype." On the Passover, as a type of Christ, we are in the main disposed to acquiesce in his conclusions, though we differ from him in one or two points.

On the extraordinary and long-agitated controversy, whether our Lord anticipated the day on which the priests, and the Jewish nation in general, celebrated the passover, we perceive that Mr. Chevallier adopts the opinion of Macknight, that our Lord and his disciples partook of it before the national day. Whether this opinion be right or wrong, we are surprised that a writer of Mr. Chevallier's apparent acuteness should lay any stress, much less rest his decision, as he seems to do, upon so very weak a foundation as his interpretation of εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν.

"On the very day," he says, "on which the passover *ought* to be slain,* and on which Christ celebrated the paschal feast with his disciples, he endured his agony and bloody sweat; and he suffered death upon the cross on a day when at least the Scribes and Pharisees, and some of the principal men among the Jews, did 'eat the passover.†'"—p. 286.

By his printing *ought* in italics, and ΕΔΕΙ in capitals, it should seem that he intends it to be inferred, that the force of the word εἰς is, to denote that the passover *ought* to have been slain on that day, but was *not* slain by the Jews in general. But the import of εἰς neither necessarily, nor ordinarily, when joined to an infinitive, has this sense. It would be an insult to our readers to bring instances, in which εἰς is used, as by our translators, to signify, with an infinitive, "*must be, was to be*—εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν, *must be killed*"—indicating that this was the usual or appointed day on which it

* Εἰς τὴν ΕΔΕΙ θύεσθαι τὸ πασχα.

† John, xviii. 28.

was to be killed, without any antithetic implication that it was *not* accordingly killed. Mr. Chevallier either is not aware, or more probably, not meaning to enter at large into the subject, does not notice that his text, John, xviii. 28. has been explained away by Whitby and others; and that there are on the other side some very cogent passages. It is not our intention, any more than Mr. Chevallier's, to discuss this difficult subject; but we must remark, that it appears to us highly improbable that an alteration of the day, appointed for celebrating a festival of such paramount importance, could have been easily effected, either by accident or design, among a people, notorious for their tenacious, and even superstitious and excessive, observance of days and seasons. And we cannot but be staggered at the incongruity with our Lord's general practice and principles, which would be manifested by his setting an example of opposition to the constituted ecclesiastical authorities;—before the abrogation of the law—on an occasion so solemn—and without pointing out their error, or assigning any reason for his conduct.

The remaining examples, to be classed under the *third division*, present no features peculiar to Mr. Chevallier's principal and characteristic positions—nor many views materially different from those taken by Outram and others who have written on these subjects. We, therefore, with the less reluctance take our leave of Mr. Chevallier, closing our remarks of him with a few brief and general remarks upon the character of his work.

The subject chosen by him is important and interesting, and has been illustrated with ability and judgment. He does not appear to have deeply examined the controversial subtleties of it; but rather to have bent his attention to the production of a work of practical utility, founded upon the recognized interpretations of our best commentators, and most orthodox divines. The style in general is dignified and clear, but seldom powerful or impressive. There is sometimes a superfluity of illustration, an excessive attention to minor and collateral subjects connected with the principal point, and an imperfect and unconnected arrangement, which fatigue the attention of the reader. In one or two instances we observe an unguarded and loose statement of his positions: as, for example.

“Its (speaking of the Old Testament) history, laws, and institutions, the apparently casual events which occurred to the Jewish people, *all* had reference to future events, which were literally fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, and were *all* fulfilled in no other.”—pp. 2, 3.

Hutchinson himself could not take a larger range, and we cannot but suppose that Mr. Chevallier would wish this to be under-

stood with many qualifications, which the terms themselves do not imply.

Indeed, he himself is sensible that more time would have been desirable to re-consider some parts of his work, and prune away others. And contemplating the extent of his subject, and the quantity of materials he has digested, it is impossible not to feel the justice of his claim for indulgence for occasional defects, upon the ground "that the period allowed by the founder's will, for the delivery and publishing of twenty lectures, is so limited."

Upon the whole, we have derived both pleasure and profit from the perusal of this volume, and recommend it to the notice of our readers.

ART. VIII.—1. *Hymns written and adapted to the Weekly Church Service of the Year*. By the Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Murray. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

2. *The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year*. Rivingtons, London; and Parker, Oxford. 2 vols. 12mo. 10s. 6d.

IT is with great pleasure we call our reader's attention, for a few minutes, to the two works before us. They may well be placed together as being essentially *ejusdem generis*, though each having a particular destination distinct from the other. And really, in the present deliquium of the poetical energies of the country, (for even down to Mr. Moore, the standing army all write prose now,) such very pretty poems as these are an agreeable singularity. They are valuable also in more fully demonstrating that devotional or sacred poetry, in general, is not necessarily dull, and in inducing us to believe, that where such poetry has been dully written, it was where the author would have written dully on the bowers of Acrasie or Armida. Of course no one of common judgment would ever think of composing a thousand lines together in a strictly devotional strain; the singleness and intensity of the predominant feeling would certainly generate monotony; for, let the poet be as discursive as he may, a poem of a devotional character must, for the most part, consist of prayer and praise alone, and the picturesque part of life and nature can only be sparingly displayed with propriety in such company. Every one remembers Milton's opinion,—that poetry ought to be simple, sensuous, and impassioned; first, intelligible without pain; secondly, full of images and not abstractions; and lastly, impregnated by the imagination. Images alone are nothing but description; those images must be fired with a spark of human sympathy to become poeti-

cal. Devotional poetry can never call much upon the imagination; it is always most successful as the efflux of pure affection, and the outpouring of the wounded or the triumphant heart. The conclusion is, (what indeed is plain enough without much reasoning,) that sacred poetry ought always to be confined to short pieces, and to be cast very much in a lyrical form.

The collection of hymns in the first of the works in question, is expressly intended for the common use of congregations in parish churches. These little poems are chiefly by the lamented Heber, but mingled with many from the pen of Mr. Milman; and some old ones by Dryden, Kenn, and Drummond, are very properly reprinted. They are not to be read as finished compositions for the cabinet, but in the light of words for simple and solemn music. They are not meant, or not only meant, to be said, but sung also.

Now it may be very fairly objected, at the outset, that any such work as the present is wholly unnecessary, or supposing its use to be prescribed, even injurious. The intention and end of all congregational singing in Christian churches, is the praise of God. It is meant that every individual Christian should sing to His glory and praise. The minister often prays for, often reads to, and always teaches the people, but the people are themselves to sing. What the peasantry of a country village are to sing, ought of course to be very simple in its construction, and very plain in meaning. It is upon such terms only, that the common people can join in the singing. We all know the wretched consequences of permitting the Brahams and Stephenses of our country parishes to enact Handel and Haydn; and a subtle train of thoughts would as certainly disable the majority of the congregation as a complicated strain of harmony.

On the other hand, it is intended by the Church, that the rich and educated should sing praises as well at least as the poor and illiterate, and therefore as care must be taken to set forth for common use nothing which may be too high for the comprehension of the most humble, so ought nothing to be prescribed which may be too low for the most dignified. The hymn or the psalm ought to be simplicity itself, but it ought also to be noble and poetical. Purity of language and ardency of feeling are the most intelligible of all things—so much so, indeed, that great obscurity is generally involved in their converse. It is mere cant to urge that if the subject matter absorbed every person's mind, as it ought to do, mere faults of style would not be observed. Let every plain man answer, that whatever his duty may or not be, in point of fact, the faults of style *do* interfere with his devotion. What reply can be made to this? But surely the versions of Sternhold and

Hopkins, and T. Brady and Tate, do not sin only by faults of style. If regarded as Davidian psalms in metre, they are so grossly and so generally unfaithful to the originals, that they lose all title to respect on the score of identity; and if taken only as hymns in themselves, can any thing, with a liberal exception of about a dozen in both the versions, be more vulgar in language, wretched in conception, and if it were worth the while to prove it on such an occasion, false in doctrine than these authorized canticles? We really are quite at a loss to know why we should entertain the least scruple about altering these metrical versions as may seem expedient. The ancient entirety of dominion has been already once invaded; the legitimate dynasty has been violated; Hopkins is now only tenant in common with Tate, and

“*Divisum imperium cum Brady, Sternhold, habet.*”

Surely, if the old 100th psalm was thought unworthy to hold its place against the new a century ago, we may very modestly take the liberty to supersede the new one itself by one still newer, or perhaps in this amongst a few other instances, by a revivor of the original. May not Heber and Milman be well commissioned to do that which our forefathers seem to have called for at the hands of the floundering Nicholas Brady, the ineffable Nahum Tate?

We do not suggest any thing like a prohibition of the old versions, but we do humbly submit to those who have power in this matter, whether it is not now a fitting time for some alteration in this particular; and whether a new collection of hymns, appropriated to the peculiar doctrine or character of the service of the day, would not be very favourably received by the nation, and be likely to excite a more reverential attention to, and a more joyful participation in, a very important part of the public worship than we commonly witness at present. We have great materials for an excellent collection of that sort in the first of the works before us.

We expressly say materials only; for though the whole volume is full of very sweet poetry, many of the pieces are quite unfit for congregational singing. The metre of some, (pp. 66. 106. 128.) the elaborateness of others, (pp. 7. 62. 87.) puts them out of the question for such a purpose. And we cannot but say that if the compilation of such hymns were to be entrusted to Mr. Milman, as in many respects might be very safely done, he *must* abjure entirely that besetting mannerism which forces almost every stanza he writes into a measured parallel with some other. This recurrence or burthen has a brilliant effect in choruses, but it must be very sparingly used; for really, of all *manners*, it is the most me-

chanical and most unworthy of a real poet. We will quote the hymn, as it is called, on the Second Sunday in Advent, which, plain imitation as it is of Lord Byron, is a striking instance of the fault of which we speak.

“ The chariot ! the chariot ! its wheels roll on fire
As the Lord cometh down in the pomp of his ire ;
Self-moving it drives on its pathway of cloud,
And the heavens with the burthen of Godhead are bow'd.

The glory ! the glory ! by myriads are pour'd
The host of the angels to wait on their Lord,
And the glorified saints and the martyrs are there,
And all who the palm-wreath of victory wear !

The trumpet ! the trumpet ! the dead have all heard :
Lo the depths of the stone-cover'd charnel are stirr'd !
From the sea, from the land, from the south and the north,
The vast generations of man are come forth !

The judgment ! the judgment ! the thrones are all set,
Where the Lamb and the white-vested elders are met !
All flesh is at once in the sight of the Lord,
And the doom of eternity hangs on his word !

Oh mercy ! Oh mercy ! look down from above,
Creator ! on us thy sad children, with love !
When beneath to their darkness the wicked are driven,
May our sanctified souls find a mansion in heaven !”

Without, therefore, stopping at present to point out more particularly those pieces which seem to us to be fit or not for the purposes of singing, we will select two or three from the whole volume, as specimens of its poetical merit in general. Bishop Heber's splendid stanzas on St. Stephen's Day, are already familiar to the public. The following are new.

“ When spring unlocks the flowers to paint the laughing soil ;
When summer's balmy showers refresh the mower's toil ;
When winter binds in frosty chains the fallow and the flood,
In God the earth rejoiceth still, and owns his Maker good.

The birds that wake the morning, and those that love the shade ;
The winds that sweep the mountain or lull the drowsy glade ;
The sun that from his amber bower rejoiceth on his way,
The moon and stars, their Master's name in silent pomp display.

Shall man, the lord of nature, expectant of the sky,
Shall man, alone unthankful, his little praise deny ?
No, let the year forsake his course, the seasons cease to be,
Thee, Master, must we always love, and, Saviour, honour Thee.

The flowers of spring may wither, the hope of summer fade,
 The autumn droop in winter, the birds forsake the shade;
 The winds be lull'd—the sun and moon forget their old decree,
 But we in nature's latest hour, O Lord! will cling to Thee."

MILMAN.

"Lord! Thou didst arise and say,
 To the troubled waters 'peace,'
 And the tempest died away.
 Down they sank, the foamy seas;
 And a calm and heaving sleep
 Spread o'er all the glassy deep,
 All the azure lake serene
 Like another heaven was seen!
 Lord! Thy gracious word repeat
 To the billows of the proud!
 Quell the tyrant's martial heart,
 Quell the fierce and changing crowd!
 Then the earth shall find repose
 From its restless strife and woes,
 And an imaged heaven appear
 On our world of darkness here."

HEBER.

"God is gone up with a merry noise
 Of saints that sing on high,
 With His own right hand and His holy arm
 He hath won the victory.
 How empty are the courts of death,
 And crush'd thy sting, despair!
 And roses bloom in the desert tomb,
 For Jesus hath been there.
 And He hath tamed the strength of Hell,
 And dragg'd him through the sky,
 And captive behind His chariot wheel,
 He hath bound captivity!
 God is gone up with a merry noise
 Of saints that sing on high;
 With His own right hand and His holy arm
 He hath won the victory!"

MILMAN.

"Bound upon th' accursed tree,
 Faint and bleeding, who is He?"

By the eyes so pale and dim,
 Streaming blood, and writhing limb,
 By the flesh with scourges torn,
 By the crown of twisted thorn,
 By the side so deeply pierced,
 By the baffled burning thirst,
 By the drooping death-dew'd brow,
 Son of Man ! 'tis Thou, 'tis Thou !

Bound upon th' accursed tree,
 Dread and awful, who is He ?
 By the sun at noon day pale,
 Shivering rocks, and rending veil,
 By earth that trembles at his doom,
 By yonder saints who burst their tomb,
 By Eden, promised ere He died
 To the felon at his side,
 Lord ! our suppliant knees we bow,
 Son of God ! 'tis Thou, 'tis Thou !

Bound upon th' accursed tree,
 Sad and dying, who is He ?
 By the last and bitter cry ;
 The ghost giv'n up in agony ;
 By the lifeless body laid
 In the chamber of the dead ;
 By the mourners come to weep
 Where the bones of Jesus sleep ;
 Crucified ! we know Thee now ;
 Son of Man, 'tis Thou, 'tis Thou !

Bound upon th' accursed tree,
 Dread and awful, who is He ?
 By the prayer for them that slew,
 ' Lord ! they know not what they do !'
 By the spoil'd and empty grave,
 By the souls he died to save,
 By the conquest he hath won,
 By the saints before his throne,
 By the rainbow round his brow,
 Son of God ! 'tis Thou, 'tis Thou !"

And can any thing be sweeter than this simple prayer ?

HEBER.

God, that madest Earth and Heaven,
 Darkness and Light !
 Who the day for toil hast given,
 For rest the night !

May Thine Angel guards defend us,
 Slumber sweet Thy mercy send us,
 Holy dreams and hopes attend us,
 This livelong night !*

The "Christian Year" is also a collection of little poems adapted to every Sunday and other holiday of the Church, and to all the collateral services. It is a tardy and, we believe, reluctant publication by the Rev. John Keble, a name well known and justly dear to Oxford. These pieces are not intended for music, like Bishop Heber's and Mr. Milman's hymns, but are the thoughtful effusions of an individual mind in constant communion with itself. We scarcely ever remember to have read so exquisite an invocation of religion in poetry. The strain of feeling throughout is imbibed from the best parts of Wordsworth's writings; but we cannot say that the purity and accuracy of that great poet's language have been so much borne in mind as they deserved to be. There is an apparent want of dexterity in very many of these pieces which seems to argue a want of practice in mere composition, and, with some exceptions, which we shall quote, there is a pervading indistinctness and want of definiteness which renders the perusal occasionally irksome. This does not proceed from vacuity, but the contrary; it is the necessary result of very deep and uncommon thinking, unaccompanied by that energy of talent and art, which divides, and distinguishes and shapes the thought into a form which human language is capable of expressing. There are many such passages even in Wordsworth's works to which twenty different meanings may be given, because the words actually used are clearly nothing beyond mere hints or hieroglyphics of the thought below. It would take too much transcription to give any adequate instance of what we reprehend

* We have often seen in MS. the following lines, written by one of the most distinguished authors now living, for the use of his own little daughter.

Ere on my bed my limbs I lay,
 God grant me grace my prayers to say !
 O God, preserve my mother dear
 In health and strength for many a-year,
 And oh! preserve my father too,
 And may I pay him reverence due ;
 And may I my best thoughts employ
 To be my parent's hope and joy !
 Oh! likewise keep my brothers both
 From evil doings and from sloth,
 And may we always love each other,
 Our friends, our father, and our mother!
 And still, O Lord, to me impart
 An innocent and grateful heart,
 That after my last sleep I may
 Awake to thy eternal day! Amen.

in Mr. Keble's style, but we mention it that he may advert to the subject himself, and that our warm and unfeigned admiration of the work in general may not induce our readers to believe that we are blind to its blemishes. However, we would much rather give instances of the uncommon beauty and sweetness of some of these thoughts in verse, and we shall be forgiven for making the following extracts.

“ ‘ They shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water-courses.’—*Isaiah*, xlv. 4.

Lessons sweet of spring returning,
 Welcome to the thoughtful heart :
 May I call ye sense or learning,
 Instinct pure, or heaven-taught art ?
 Be your title what it may,
 Sweet the lengthening April day,
 While with you the soul is free,
 Ranging wild o'er hill and lea.

Soft as Memnon's harp at morning,
 To the inward ear devout,
 Touch'd by light, with heavenly warning
 Your transporting chords ring out.
 Every leaf in every nook,
 Every wave in every brook,
 Chanting with a solemn voice,
 Minds us of our better choice.

Needs no show of mountain hoary,
 Winding shore or deepening glen,
 Where the landscape in its glory
 Teaches truth to wandering men—
 Give true hearts but earth and sky,
 And some flowers to bloom and die—
 Homely scenes and simple views
 Lowly thought may best infuse.

See the soft green willow springing
 Where the waters gently pass
 Every way her free arms flinging
 O'er the moist and reedy grass.
 Long ere winter blasts are fled,
 See her tipt with vernal red,
 And her kindly flower display'd
 Ere her leaf can cast a shade.

Though the rudest hand assail her,
 Patiently she droops awhile,
 But when showers and breezes hail her
 Wears again her willing smile.

Thus I learn contentment's power
 From the slighted willow bower,
 Ready to give thanks and live
 On the least that Heaven may give.

If, the quiet streamlet leaving,
 Up the stony vale I wind,
 Haply half in fancy grieving
 For the shades I leave behind,
 By the dusty wayside drear,
 Nightingales with joyous cheer,
 Sing my sadness to reprove,
 Gladlier than in cultur'd grove.

Where the thickest boughs are twining
 Of the greenest darkest tree,
 There they plunge, the light declining—
 All may hear, but none may see:
 Fearless of the passing hoof,
 Hardly will they fleet aloof ;
 So they live in modest ways,
 Trust entire, and ceaseless praise.

“ ‘Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow.’—*St. Matthew*, vi. 26.

Sweet nurslings of the vernal skies,
 Bath'd in soft airs, and fed with dew
 What more than magic in you lies
 To fill the heart's fond view ?
 In childhood's sports, companions gay,
 In sorrow, on life's downward way,
 How soothing ! in our last decay
 Memorials prompt and true.

Relics ye are of Eden's bowers,
 As pure, as fragrant, and as fair,
 As when ye crown'd the sunshine hours
 Of happy wanderers there.
 Fall'n all beside—the world of life
 How is it stain'd with fear and strife !
 In Reason's world what storms are rife,
 What passions range and glare !

But cheerful and unchanged the while
 Your first and perfect form ye show,
 The same that won Eve's matron smile
 In the world's opening glow.
 The stars of heaven a course are taught
 Too high above our human thought ;—
 Ye may be found if ye are sought,
 And as we gaze, we know.

Ye dwell beside our paths and homes,
 Our paths of sin, our homes of sorrow,
 And guilty man, where'er he roams,
 Your innocent mirth may borrow.
 The birds of air before us fleet,
 They cannot brook our shame to meet—
 But we may taste your solace sweet
 And come again to-morrow.

Ye fearless in your nests abide—
 Nor may we scorn, too proudly wise,
 Your silent lessons undescried
 By all but lowly eyes :
 For ye could draw the admiring gaze
 Of him who worlds and hearts surveys :
 Your order wild, your fragrant maze,
 He taught us how to prize.

Ye felt your Maker's smile that hour,
 As when He paused and owned you good ;
 His blessing on earth's primal bower,
 Ye feel it all renew'd.
 What care ye now, if winter's storm
 Sweep ruthless o'er each silken form ?
 Christ's blessing at your heart is warm,
 Ye fear no vexing mood.

Alas ! of thousand bosoms kind,
 That daily court you and caress,
 How few the happy secret find
 Of your calm loveliness !
 ' Live for to-day ! to-morrow's light
 To-morrow's cares shall bring to sight
 Go sleep like closing flowers at night,
 And Heaven thy morn will bless.' "

If we had not quoted so much already, we could not have resisted the pleasure of setting before our readers the two exquisite little poems on Baptism and Matrimony. But it is time to conclude.

A collection of poems, like the present, composed at various times, upon the suggestion of extremely different occasions, and flowing from feelings of diverse character, is generally read at a great disadvantage. Instead of being thoughtfully perused one by one as their occasioning epochs occur, they are, of course, usually run over rapidly at one or two sittings; the more brilliant passages alone arrest the attention, whilst the peculiarity of each poem is lost in that of its immediate successor. This is what all

writers of sonnets have to encounter, and what should teach their authors never, if it were possible, to print two of them together. But the "Christian Year" is a book to be recurred to often, and we believe it will for the most part please more and more upon each review. We have so high a sense of its genuine worth, that we hope this notice of it may be the means of introducing it into many families who might otherwise pass it over as one among the ordinarily dull things to which the press, although it gave birth, cannot impart life. It may well be placed next or near to the pure and pleasing poetry of George Herbert.



- ART. IX.—1. *Human Sacrifices in India. Substance of the Speech of John Poynder, Esq. at the Courts of Proprietors of East India Stock, held on the 21st and 28th days of March, 1827.* London. Hatchard and Son. 8vo. pp. 261. 6s.
2. *Substance of the Speech of Randle Jackson, Esq. on the same subject.* 1827. London. Parbury, Allen and Co. 8vo. pp. 28. 1s.

THE tracts to which we are now about to direct the attention of our readers, are the substance of two speeches delivered at the India House, before a General Court of Proprietors, in the spring of the present year, in support of the following resolution:—

“That this Court, taking into consideration the continuance of human sacrifices in India, is of opinion, that in the case of all rites or ceremonies involving the destruction of life, it is the duty of a paternal government to interpose for their prevention; and therefore recommends to the Honourable Court of Directors to transmit such instructions to India as that Court may deem most expedient for accomplishing this object, consistently with all practicable attention to the feelings of the natives.”

The motion was made by Mr. Poynder, and seconded by Sir C. Forbes; and the speech of Mr. Randle Jackson was delivered in the course of the debate.

That the practice of the suttee referred to in this motion is one which has long called for serious examination and inquiry, more particularly in the quarter where it has been proposed, will scarcely be denied by any one to whom the history of our policy in India is known; and that Mr. Poynder has amply deserved the thanks of every friend of humanity, for the pains he has bestowed, and the light he has thrown upon the subject, will be cordially acknowledged by all who will take the pains to consider fairly the documents before us, and attend to the consequences to which

they lead. To us, indeed, considering the character of the rite, and looking back on all that has been said and done upon it for some time past, it does appear, that in no quarter of the British public has it received that degree of attention which its importance so well deserves. It is true that parliament has not been inattentive to it; from their committee a long and elaborate report has proceeded, containing a great variety of important and interesting matter, which constitutes the groundwork of the present motion; but this report was published in separate portions and at distant intervals, and is accessible only to a few; and on these accounts, perhaps, as well as others, has excited hitherto but a small portion of the public interest. Once or twice, indeed, towards the close of the last session, a solitary petition from some obscure village or borough, against the suttee, found its way to the table of the House; but its voice was scarcely heard amidst the clamours for cheap corn and Catholic emancipation; and no man said—God speed ye. Meanwhile the unholy rite reigns triumphant in India, and we have the fact regularly recorded for our information, that in Bengal alone—a province every where pervaded by British influence, and the very centre of the British power—six hundred widows, comprehending females of almost every age, continue to be annually burnt alive upon the funeral piles of their husbands, amidst the shouts of savage and bigoted mobs, and under the active superintendence of their interested priests and relations.

Now this apathy, so unusual, so unnatural I would say, to Englishmen, upon a subject involving such deep and extensive interests, can only be accounted for upon the principle of erroneous or defective information; and we speak, we are sure, the sentiments of the great body of our countrymen who may read these documents, when we say that they have been under some degree of delusion respecting it. It is not that they have been unacquainted with the details of this horrid sacrifice, or insensible to the shame of its continuance under an enlightened government like ours; but they have neither known nor considered it enough: nor can we wonder at their indifference, for besides the distance of the place and the staleness of the story, (and even to those nearer, as one of the chaplains observes, such scenes grow horribly familiar,) there are other causes which have contributed to deaden their feelings, and to lull them into a quiet acquiescence in the rite. They have been persuaded that the great body of these women are at least voluntary sufferers, the high-minded victims of a mistaken sense of duty, passing, as they imagine, through a painful death to a triumphant re-union with their lords; above all, they have believed that the practice itself was so firmly

rooted in the minds of the people, so guarded and sanctioned by the highest and most revered authorities of the land, that it could not at present be torn from them, save by a degree of violence which would drive the people into insurrection, and endanger the stability of the government. This mist, with all its comfortable and quiet visions, Mr. Poynder has removed from our eyes: henceforth no man can lay the flattering unction to his soul, that this monstrous practice is softened by a single feature of beauty or comeliness, or excused by any fair plea of state policy or necessity; he has exhibited to us the rite in all its native deformity; he has shown us that the suttee (to use the language of the Directors) is not a tenet of their religion to which the people are enthusiastically attached, but an abuse of religion, fostered by interested priests and relations for the gratification of their accursed avarice—that the victims are frequently too young to be capable of a deliberate choice—that in some cases they are brought to the pile under the influence of stupifying or maddening drugs, and in others are driven back violently and remorselessly into the flames, when they are endeavouring to make their escape from them. Above all, he has proved to us incontestably, that if ever there was a period when a prohibition from our government was dangerous, that period is gone by—that actual interference has already taken place in various instances, as well by general regulations as by individual authority—and that though followed by different consequences, according as it was judicious or injudicious, it has in no case provoked serious disturbance, or otherwise been attended with danger to the state. These are truths which result forcibly from the facts and the reasonings of Mr. Poynder, and under the impression they create, we feel that we should be wanting to the cause of British honour and humanity, wanting to our own public duty, and wanting, above all, to the interests of that religion which it is our office and our pride to advocate, if we did not endeavour, with all our influence, to give publicity to his speech, and to join heart and hand in his endeavours for the removal of a practice, which, if continued one moment longer than is absolutely necessary, must be a blot upon the British name, and will cry as loudly as the blood of Abel for vengeance upon all who have the power, and refuse to aid in wiping it away. Of Mr. Poynder's fitness for the task he has undertaken, we may speak with great confidence and satisfaction. He has brought to it a degree of industry, accuracy, and humanity, which do him the greatest credit, and are altogether worthy of his cause; and though we do not always agree with him in the use he has made of his materials, it is but justice to him to say, that the general tone and character of his speech

are exactly such as became the gravity of the question and the important consequences which are involved in it. Evidently a man of warm heart himself, and occupied with a subject pregnant, both in its character and details, with matter calculated to animate the coldest, he has wisely chosen by calm and rational argument to make a steady and permanent impression upon his audience. His language is throughout moderate—his views, with one exception, sober and comprehensive; and his facts, which are abundant and decisive, and of the first authority, are skilfully and seasonably brought forward, whether to illustrate or to confirm his reasoning; above all, we admire the manliness and spirit which carry him, without fear or favour, directly to his object, and evince the sincerity of his mind. We may add too, as a further recommendation of his speech, that it was successful; and when we consider the circumstances under which it was delivered—that it was addressed to the great body of the proprietors of India stock, many of whom are shrewd, sensible, and well-informed men, accustomed to debate, long conversant with Indian affairs, and deeply interested in the peace and security of our eastern empire; and in the presence of the Directors themselves, who were prepared for the discussion, and possessed of ample means to contradict immediately whatever might be unfounded, and to correct what was exaggerated—we know not where to look for a more decisive testimony in his favour, than the fact, that in such an assembly, after a long hearing, his motion was carried by a great majority, only five proprietors dividing against it.

We shall now proceed to Mr. Poynder's speech, and in order to prepare our readers for a more comprehensive view of the argument, we shall endeavour, in the first instance, to make them well acquainted with the character and features of the sacrifice itself; for which purpose we shall lay before them the description of several suttees, furnished at different periods by official persons of the highest authority, and extracted from the parliamentary papers by Mr. Poynder. The first is a report of Sir Charles Mallet, well adapted to introduce the series, because exempt from every circumstance of extraordinary cruelty, and only comprising the common features of the rite.

“ After detailing the preparations, among which the principal was, that she distributed among the Brahmins 2000 rupees, and the jewels with which she was decorated, which will sufficiently account for the performance taking place at all, Sir Charles proceeds.—‘ Now, with her hands indeed held up to heaven, but with her poor eyes cast in a gaze of total abstraction, deep into the den of anguish that awaited her, she stopped awhile, a piteous statue! At length, without altering a feature,

or the least agitation of her frame, she ascended by the door-way, and lying down beside her husband's corpse, gave herself, in the meridian of life and beauty, a victim to a barbarous and cruelly consecrated error of misguided faith. As soon as she entered, she was hid from our view by bundles of straw, with which the aperture was closed up; and all the actors in this tragic scene, seemed to vie with each other who should be most forward in hurrying it to a conclusion. At once, some darkened the air with a cloud of goolol; some, darting their hatchets at the suspending cords, felled the laden roof upon her; and others rushed eagerly forward to apply the fatal torch. Happily, in this moment of insufferable agony, when the mind must have lost its dominion, and the ear expected to be pierced with the unavailing cries of nature, the welcome din of the trumpet broke forth from every quarter.

[“ First, Moloch, horrid king! besmeared with blood
Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears;
Tho' for *the noise of drums and timbrels loud,*
Their children's cries *unheard,* that past thro' fire
To his grim idol.”—*Milton.*]

“ ‘ A little girl, about four years of age, the fruit of the union, survives them. The mother was nineteen;—her stature was above the middle standard;—her form elegant, and her features interesting and expressive;—her eyes in particular, large, bold, and commanding. At the solemn moment in which alone I saw her, these beauties were conspicuous notwithstanding her face was discoloured with turmeric, her hair disbevelled, and wildly adorned with flowers; and her looks, as they forcibly struck me throughout the ceremony, like those of one whose senses wandered.’—vol. i. p. 1.*

“ This was before the government's interference; but a second instance is mentioned by Mr. Bird, the magistrate of Ghazeepore, in 1817.

“ ‘ If it were desired,’ says he, ‘ to pourtray a scene which would thrill with horror every heart, not entirely dead to the touch of human sympathy, it would suffice to describe a father, regardless of the affection of his tender child, in having already suffered one of the severest miseries, with tearless eye leading her forth a spectacle to the assembled multitude, who, with barbarous cries, demand the sacrifice; and unrelentingly delivering up the unconscious and unresisting victim to an untimely death, accompanied by the most cruel tortures.’—vol. i. p. 136.

“ The following case may afford a specimen of the rite, when attended with circumstances of violence and coercion, of which too many, equally afflicting, occur in the Parliamentary Papers. It has already been before the public, and is related on the testimony of Dr. Marshman, an unexceptionable living witness.

“ ‘ *January 9, 1807.*

“ ‘ A person informing us that a woman was about to be burnt with the corpse of her husband near our house, I, with several others, hastened to the place; but, before we could arrive, the pile was in flames. It was a horrible sight;—the most shocking indifference and levity appeared among those who were present. I never saw anything more

* “ The references are to the six volumes of the Parliamentary Papers.”

brutal than their behaviour. The dreadful scene had not the least appearance of a religious ceremony. It resembled an abandoned rabble of boys in England, collected for the purpose of worrying to death a cat or dog. A bamboo, perhaps twenty feet long, had been fastened at one end to a stake driven into the ground, and held down over the fire by men at the other. Such were the confusion, the levity, the burst of brutal laughter, while the poor woman was burning alive before their eyes, that it seemed as if every spark of humanity was extinguished by this accursed superstition. That which added to the cruelty, was, the smallness of the fire. It did not consist of so much wood as we consume in dressing a dinner—no, not this fire that was to consume the living and the dead! I saw the legs of the poor creature hanging out of the fire, while her body was in flames. After a while, they took a bamboo, ten or twelve feet long, and stirred it, pushing and beating the half-consumed corpses as you would repair a fire of green wood, by throwing the unconsumed pieces into the middle. Perceiving the legs hanging out, they beat them with the bamboo for some time, in order to break the ligatures which fastened them at the knees; (for they would not have come near to touch them for the world.) At length they succeeded in bending them upwards into the fire, the skin and muscles giving way, and discovering the knee sockets bare, with the balls of the leg bones—a sight this, which, I need not say, made me thrill with horror, especially when I recollected that this hapless victim of superstition was alive but a few minutes before. To have seen savage wolves thus tearing a human body limb from limb, would have been shocking; but to see relations and neighbours do this to one with whom they had familiarly conversed not an hour before, and to do it with an air of levity, was almost too much for me to bear.

“ ‘ You expect, perhaps, to hear, that this unhappy victim was the wife of some Brahmin of high caste. She was the wife of a barber, who dwelt in Serampore, and had died that morning, leaving the son I have mentioned, and a daughter of about eleven years of age. Thus has this infernal superstition aggravated the common miseries of life, and left these children stripped of both their parents in one day. Nor is this an uncommon case. It often happens to children far more helpless than these; sometimes to children possessed of property, which is then left, as well as themselves, to the mercy of those who have decoyed their mother to their father’s funeral pile!’ ”—*Poynder*, pp. 5—9.

“ In further proof that any other feelings than those of religion characterize the rite, we may again refer to the Parliamentary Papers. In a case there detailed in the Reports of 1815, it is stated that all of the deceased’s caste came as to an entertainment, and that previous to his death, the husband was under the influence of liquor, while after it, his wife danced and sung.

“ Mr. EWER, the acting superintendent of police in the Lower Provinces, in his appeal to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th November, 1818, says of these rites—

“ ‘ Her relations, her attendants, and the surrounding crowd—men, women, and children—will be seen to wear one face of merriment.

which in our days attends a boxing match or a bull-bait. The crowd assemble to see a show, which, in their estimation, affords more amusement than any other public exhibition with which they are acquainted; and the sacrifice is completed because the family is anxious to get rid of an incumbrance, and the Brahmins desirous of a feast and a present.'

"I therefore submit that the practice has little or no connexion with their religion; and in further proof that interested motives alone operate in inducing the act, I may refer to the following appeal made to the Governor General in Council, by Mr. Ewer, acting superintendent of police in the lower provinces, dated Calcutta, 18th November, 1818:—

"Her relations are directly interested in her death. If she had a son, he may, perhaps, wish to be relieved from the expense of maintaining a mother, and the trouble of listening to her unseasonable advice. If she has none, her husband's male relations will take care that she stand not in their way, by claiming his estate for life, which is her legal right. The Brahmins are paid for their services, and are of course interested.

"If the relations chance to bestow a thought on the consequences of the sacrifice, it will be directed to the benefit which may thereby accrue to themselves in this world or the next. The future happiness of the sufferer and her deceased husband is much too disinterested a consideration to deserve one thought.'—vol. i. p. 227.

"In proof of the extreme cruelty of the act, I will read an extract of a letter addressed to me by one of the civil servants of the East India Company:—

"I have myself known children of eleven years old burnt, for marriage being solemnized at the age of five or six, amongst the opulent natives, and the child being termed a wife from that period, though she does not quit her parents' roof till the age of maturity, she is liable to be sacrificed at her husband's funeral.'

"With regard to the frauds of the Brahmins, it appears from answers of the Bombay Pundits, that the victim, before the sacrifice, makes an offering of a cow, or the value of one, to a Brahmin, for the purpose of his propitiating the gods, and prevailing on them to render the sacrifice *free from pain*.—vol. iv. p. 199.

"And as to the power of the Brahmins over the wishes of female relations, the acting magistrate of Midnapore, writing to Sir John Shore, Governor General of Fort William, 17th May, 1797, says of one intended sacrifice—'She is scarcely nine years of age; her aunt used her endeavours to dissuade her from the act, but the higher order of Brahmins have filled her head with such notions of its propriety, that I fear it will be accomplished.'—vol. i. p. 23."—*Poynder*, pp. 10—12.

To this picture, drawn in such lively colours from the facts, we have only to add, upon the same authority, viz. the parliamentary report, a statement of the numbers sacrificed in Bengal alone during a period of nine years, beginning 1815 and ending 1824.

1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820	1821	1822	1823
378	442	707	839	650	597	654	583	575

These numbers laid together form a total in the single Presidency of Bengal, in nine years, of	5425
In eight years, in Fort St. George, of	287
In nine years, in Bombay, of	248
	5960

There being no returns for Tanjore for the six years from 1814 to 1819 (inclusive), I have taken as the lowest possible estimate for the whole of these six years 40*

Which will form a total of nine years for the three Presidencies, of 6000 of which 5425 were in the Presidency of Bengal alone.

“The number of children of various ages which I estimate as having been left by the only surviving parent, in the Presidency of Bengal only, omitting entirely the two other Presidencies, will have amounted to 5128 in nine years.”—*Poynder*, p. 4.

It takes but little time to make this statement, and less, perhaps, of our readers' will be occupied with reading it; and it is very possible, that in both cases the mechanical process may be passed through without much emotion or uneasiness; but if any one will reflect for a moment upon the scenes which have been just described, and then consider that in Bengal alone 5425 such sacrifices have been consummated in the short period of nine years, and 5128 fatherless children have been thereby deprived of their only surviving parents, and all this by neighbours and relations, in a country governed by men professing the most enlightened and the most benevolent principles both of policy and of religion, it is impossible for him to rise from the contemplation without strong feelings of sorrow, mingled with shame and indignation. Mr. Poynder says it may be safely and easily abolished, and that every thing short of abolition is only an aggravation of the evil—let us attend to his reasoning—in furtherance of which he lays down two propositions, to which, he says, all his observations may be more or less referred.

1st. Enough has not been done by the government at home and abroad towards the suppression of this practice.

2d. That more may now be done with the most perfect security to our Indian empire.

In considering the former of these propositions, the first step, no doubt, is to inquire what has been done; and here we cannot do better than take Mr. Poynder's own account.

“From the establishment of the British power in India, nothing was attempted by the government there, in the way of interference, until the year 1805.

* “17 per annum, returned in 1820, would be for the six years not returned, 102; but I have taken the low amount of 40 for that whole period, as desiring to be within the limits in a doubtful case.”

“ On the 5th February of that year, when the members of Council consisted of Lord Wellesley, Lord Lake, Sir George Barlow, and Mr. Udney, the Governor General in Council addressed the law court of the Nizamut Adawlut, by a letter of that date, in which it is expressly stated to be ‘ one of the fundamental maxims of the British government to consult the religious opinions, customs and prejudices of the natives, in all cases in which it has been practicable, CONSISTENTLY WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALITY, REASON AND HUMANITY;’ after which, the Governor General in Council adds, that he ‘ considers it to be an indispensable duty to ascertain whether this unnatural and inhuman custom can be abolished altogether;’ and desires they will ‘ ascertain how far the practice is founded on the religious opinions of the Hindoos. If not grounded in any precept of their law, the Governor General in Council hopes that the custom may gradually, if not immediately, be altogether abolished. If, however, the entire abolition should appear to the Court to be impracticable in itself, or inexpedient, as offending any established religious opinion of the Hindoos,’ then the Court are desired to ‘ consider the best means of preventing the abuses;’ among which are noticed, the administering of intoxicating drugs, and sacrifices at immature age. Now, taking this letter as a whole, nothing can be clearer than that Marquis Wellesley and his council intended throughout, that the toleration even of ‘ religious opinions, customs and prejudices,’ (I quote their own words,) could only be permitted when they should be (again I quote them) ‘ in consistency with the principles of morality, reason and humanity.’

“ I apprehend this to be clearly a sound and legitimate principle of legislation, for which the supreme government had the sanction of no less authority than Mr. Locke, which has never yet been attempted to be controverted. He says, ‘ The magistrate ought not to forbid the preaching or professing of any speculative opinions, because they have no relation to the civil rights of the subject, nor do they break the public peace of societies. The post of a magistrate is only to take care that the commonwealth receive no prejudice, and that there be no injury done to any one in *life* and estate. You will say, if some have a mind to sacrifice infants, or practice *any other such heinous enormities*, is the magistrate obliged to tolerate them, because they are committed in a religious assembly?—I answer, No. They are not lawful in the ordinary course of life, nor in any private house, and, therefore, neither are they so in the worship of God.’

“ And again.—‘ I say no opinions contrary to human society, or to those moral rules which are necessary to the preservation of civil society, are to be tolerated by the magistrate.’ ”—*Poynder*, pp. 12—14.

We are now arrived at a point where it behoves us to pause for awhile, and to examine well the ground upon which it is proposed for us to proceed; for agreeing, as we do most cordially, with Mr. Poynder in all his results, as well, indeed, as in the greater part of his reasoning, and not less anxious than himself for the complete triumph of his cause, we are the

more bound to place the question upon its true grounds, and not to leave unexamined and unexplained any position, particularly at the outset, which may have the effect of perplexing or alarming the reader, or be a stumbling block in his way. Of such a character is the political dogma, here erroneously, as we conceive, ascribed to Lord Wellesley, and incautiously adopted by Mr. Poynder. We cannot wonder, indeed, that from a document so loosely worded, and so inconsistent, to say the truth, with itself, Mr. Poynder should have drawn a conclusion different from our own, but that he should have attached so much importance to this inference—that he should have adopted it as a practical basis of Indian legislation, and frequently recurred to it as such, is, we confess, matter both of surprise and regret to us; more particularly as, in our view of the case, so far from being necessary or even useful to his argument, it would operate as an incumbrance, and serve only to excite prejudice in the minds of those whom he wishes to conciliate and to convince. But first let us examine the Letter itself. Unquestionably, Lord Wellesley and his Council do lay it down as one of the fundamental maxims of the British government in India, to consult the religious opinions, customs and prejudices of the natives, in all cases in which it has been practicable, consistently with the principles of morality, reason and humanity; and if they had stopped here, we see not how we could avoid the inference contended for by Mr. Poynder, that *the toleration of religious opinions could, in their view, only be permitted when they should be consistent with the principles aforesaid*, viz. morality, reason and humanity. But looking to what immediately follows, taking the letter as a whole, and considering, above all, the practical illustration, afforded by the conduct of all the parties connected with it, we are compelled to come to a conclusion directly opposite to that of Mr. Poynder, but more, we think, consonant to the reason of the case. If Lord Wellesley and his Council had thought it a sufficient ground at all times for refusing toleration to any practice in India, that it was not consistent with reason, &c. why, having determined this point in the very outset of the present case, why does he not proceed immediately to act upon it? Why does he request the court of Nizamut Adawlut to inquire of the Pundits (the native interpreters of the Hindoo law) whether this rite, thus denounced by him as inhuman and irrational, was founded upon the religious opinions of the Hindoos or not? Why does he express a hope that if it were not founded upon any precept of the law, it might be gradually, if not immediately, abolished; but that if it were *inexpedient or impracticable to abolish it, as offending any established religious opinion of the Hindoos*, it might be freed from excesses or abuse.

Nothing can be more clear from all this, than that the paramount consideration with Lord Wellesley, arising from the necessity of the case, was the religious sanction; and that, in direct contradiction to Mr. Poynder, the true inference from it is, that, in his view, a religious opinion must sometimes be tolerated, even though not consistent with reason, &c. if it be founded upon the laws and prejudices of the country. And the conduct of all the parties is entirely of a piece with this construction. The court did consult the Pundits, and having reported their answer to Lord Wellesley and the Council, which was to this effect, that “the rite is not prescribed or commanded, but only permitted by the Shaster,” they concluded by declaring their opinion, that it was impracticable at that time, consistently with the principles of indulgence laid down, immediately to abolish it. In consequence of this report, Lord Wellesley proceeded no farther in his attempt, and left India some years afterwards, without advancing a single step towards the abolition of the suttee.

And now let us turn, for a moment, to the proposition itself, which amounts to this, that no practice “or even religious opinion ought to be permitted which is inconsistent with morality, reason, or humanity.” Assuredly, if Mr. Poynder had not been dazzled by his supposed authority, and had relied more upon his own judgment, he would have seen that this maxim authorizes a breadth and a minuteness of interference, not only unfitted for India, but infinitely too comprehensive for any society of human beings whatever. Under the theocracy of the Jews, we are expressly told, that a practice, afterwards condemned by our Lord as immoral, was tolerated by Moses, on account of the hardness of their hearts; and even in the country in which we write, remarkable as it is for the enlightened principles of its legislation, the intelligence of the public mind, and the omnipotence of parliament, how many practices are there inconsistent with one or more of these principles, which the government must, and does, tolerate, either because it is not able to define them accurately, or cannot visit them penally, without infringing upon the liberty of the subject, or because, upon sound principles of jurisprudence, it has no right to interfere with them at all. And if this be the case here, how much more necessary must it be in India, which abounds throughout with customs and prejudices as absurd and irrational as they are inveterate? What, for instance, shall we say to the Caste? Can there be imagined, or invented, a habit more inconsistent with all the principles before mentioned—more hostile to the rights and privileges of human beings—more repugnant to morality and reason and true religion, than

this all-pervading, all-corrupting principle? Cruel, inhuman, and revolting as is the burning of Hindoo widows, we have no hesitation in saying, that the moral evil effected by it is light in comparison with the multifarious and extensive and penetrating mischiefs of the Caste. But were we to apply this political dogma in the summary way proposed, were we to refuse to tolerate the Caste, because inconsistent with reason and humanity, who is there that would be hardy enough to ensure the possession of India to us for a single year. We should infallibly rivet faster the chains of superstition, which begin now to hang more loosely on their necks, and put off, perhaps for centuries, the dawning of that glorious day, which, under a cautious and prudent administration of our government, will soon, we trust, be permitted to shine upon them.

We bow with great respect to the authority of Mr. Locke, here quoted by Mr. Poynder, nor less to that of Blackstone, more cautiously brought forward by Mr. Randle Jackson, in his humane and excellent speech; we acknowledge that the permission of cruelty and inhumanity is a high crime and offence in any government which has it in its power to remove it; and that the acts of all governments should ever be consistent with reason and humanity. But these authorities, however applicable to the particular case, give no sanction whatever to the sweeping position maintained by Mr. Poynder. It is as plain as words can make it, that with these great juriconsults the right of the government to prohibit is grounded upon the injury done or apprehended to others by the action or opinion, and not upon its inconsistency with any of the principles here stated, or upon the religious offence with which the government has no direct concern. Besides, it must be obvious to every thinking man, that the government contemplated by these great authorities is quite another thing from that which is actually exercised by the Directors of the Company over its millions of Indian subjects. For what are the requisites which constitute a government in their sense of the word? Fortunately, Blackstone himself has answered the question. They are Wisdom, Goodness, and Power:—wisdom to discern the real interest of the community, goodness to endeavour always to pursue that real interest, and strength or power to carry this knowledge and intention into action.

Now, without dwelling for a moment upon the two former qualities, of which we are willing to allow a full share to the Directors, will any one venture to affirm that the Company do in fact possess the power either of carrying into effect every measure which wisdom should decree, and benevolence should prompt—

or of putting down every practice which may be repugnant to those qualities? Surely it is, at all times, the dictate of common sense to aim at what is practicable before we aspire to that which is perfect; and if ever there was a case where it was more necessary to consult “*quid valeant humeri quid ferre recusant,*” it must be this, in which a company of merchants in England are legislating for one hundred millions of people differing in language, manners, religion, and in another hemisphere. With them, every such interference involves not only a question of justice and equity, but of expediency and practicability and of power; not because the prejudices and opinions of the natives ought in no case to be violated, but simply because in some they cannot be violated without danger to the government, and the hazard of eventual injury to the State. What then, it may be asked, are the grounds on which we would be content to advocate this cause? We answer, precisely on those on which Mr. Poynder himself has argued it; for it is remarkable, that fondly as he seems to have clung to this position at the outset of his speech, no sooner does he enter into the real business of the contest than his own better sense prevails, and he practically abandons it altogether. The argument is this: not simply that the suttee is irrational, or immoral, (for simple idolatry is highly irrational,) but that being notoriously injurious to the subject, the magistrate has a right to prohibit it; and that being not founded on the religious commands of their divine legislator, as appears plainly from the authorities brought forward, nor yet rooted in the affections of the people, as the accounts of the local magistrates affirm, it is practicable, and therefore their duty, to abolish it. This is the ground taken by Bishop Heber, and applied to this very subject in his *Stricture on the Liberty of Prophesying*, by Taylor. After stating the general principle—

“But if the particular species of idolatry complained of be attended with obscene or cruel rites; or, if the public processions or ostentatious sacrifices of its votaries have an evident tendency to shock the feelings of the majority of their fellow-citizens, and disturb the public tranquillity, the magistrate is not only permitted, but obliged in conscience to punish or restrain them according to his power, and in such measure as the interests of the community under his charge may require.”——
“Nor, whatever religious prejudice may be pleaded, did our Indian government do wrong in forbidding the murder of female children; nor would it do wrong (however a real or mistaken policy may forbid the measure) in preventing the sacrifice of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands.”

Having now expressed ourselves fully upon the only point (an important one) in which we have the misfortune to differ from

Mr. Poynder, we shall now proceed with his proofs of the first proposition, that the Company have not done so much as they might have done with safety towards the abolition of this rite.

After the correspondence alluded to, Lord Wellesley, as we have already stated, took no further step, nor did he adopt the measures proposed by the Court for its gradual prohibition. To him succeeded the Marquis Cornwallis, and afterwards Sir George Barlow, both of whom equally refrained from acceding to the recommendation.

“ Sir George Barlow was succeeded by Lord Minto, when on the 3d Sept. 1812, after more than seven years and an half had transpired from the first recommendation, and when not only the Marquis Wellesley, who was governor in chief, in June 1805, but when every individual member of that government had been changed, [the supreme Court now consisting of *Lord Minto*, *Sir George Hewitt*, *Mr. Lumsden*, and *Mr. Colebrooke*,] the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, by their letter dated 3d Sept. 1812, forwarded to the supreme government the letter of a magistrate who had recently applied for instructions for his guidance, and the legal court then remind such new government of the letter of the Governor-General in Council, [Marquis Wellesley,] dated the 5th Feb. 1805—of their consequent reference to the Pundits—and of the Prohibitory Regulations then proposed by them to be adopted, but which had never to that hour been sanctioned by Lord Wellesley’s, or by any succeeding, government.” —*Poynder*, pp. 19, 20.

Thus, after some discussion, the prohibiting regulations recommended by the Court in 1805, were adopted in 1813, upon the following principle:—To allow the practice in those cases in which it is countenanced by their religion, and to prevent it in others, in which it is by the same authority prohibited as in the cases of,

“ 1st. Compulsion.

“ 2d. Obtaining the woman’s assent to the sacrifice by administering intoxicating drugs.

“ 3d. Non-age [the proper term of years for performing the sacrifice, being to be ascertained from the Pundits, and which is subsequently reported to be 16.]

“ 4th. Pregnancy.

“ The Governor-General in Council then states, that the measures already proposed by the court of Nizamut Adawlut appear well adapted to the purpose, (though upwards of seven years and an half had now elapsed without their adoption,) and these measures are—that the magistrates should direct the police officers to obtain the earliest information of an intended sacrifice, and such officers were then either to attend, or depute an officer under them to ascertain the circumstances, and if within the prohibited rules, the officer was to take the necessary measures to prevent the woman being burned, apprizing the relations or others concerned that they would be dealt with as criminals if they proceeded, and

the officers were directed to report monthly to the magistrate every case and its circumstances.”—*Poynder*, p. 21.

To these two other cases of prohibition were added, the first in 1814, the next in 1817; first, When the woman had a child under three years of age, unless some one would agree to maintain it; and second, The case of Post-Cremation.

On the first, Mr. Poynder remarks,

“ This invitation to new crime, and open toleration of it, is most deeply to be deplored, as, indeed, the court themselves are subsequently compelled to admit in five years after, namely, by their Report on the Returns of 1815 and 1816, dated 25th June, 1817, where they state that, ‘ From two texts cited in the digest of Hindoo law, it seems evident that mothers of infant children were originally prohibited from abandoning their offspring when so much in need of their maternal care, to ascend the funeral pile. *VRIHASPATI* says, expressly, that the mother of an infant child may ‘ not relinquish the care of her infant child to ascend the pile.’—And it is the exposition of a SINGLE commentator, (*Rughanundhand*,) whose authority is confined to *BENGAL*; that if the infant can be nurtured by any other person, the mother is entitled to burn.’—[See vol. i. p. 101.] The Court then suggest the expediency of extending the period from three to seven years, a provision, which, however, never took place; so that from that time to the present, while the best construction of Hindoo law is actually opposed to mothers of infants being burnt at all, the Court, upon their own recorded admission, have, under no better authority than what they admit to be the opinion of one commentator alone, of merely local authority, and this only an opinion *by inference* [see vol. i. p. 179.] sanctioned the practice of receiving security for the maintenance of these children, and permitted that practice to continue from the year 1814 to this time, (thirteen years,) by which an immense additional number of adult lives have undoubtedly fallen victims, and so many more children been made orphans!”—*Poynder*, pp. 22, 23.

The last is explained thus :—

“ To these Prohibitory Regulations was also added another in the year 1817, (arising out of cases which occurred in 1816,) relating to the widow’s burning *with* the body of her husband or *after* it; and this distinction was also made, as usual, upon the authority of the Pundits, whose opinion may be seen in vol. i. p. 111. The case of burning with the body, or *Sahamarana*, as it is termed, is the ordinary rite of con-cremation; but that of burning subsequently, or post-cremation, called *Anoo-marana*, is when the widow is sacrificed, with the sandals, turban, or other relic of the deceased, and which is only permitted to such widows as are absent from their husbands at the time of their death, provided they burn immediately on receiving the intelligence; or to such as are under another legal disqualification at that period, provided the cause be removed in a day or two; the legal authority for the preferable doctrine of burning at the same pile being, that ‘ a husband having been burnt on the preceding day, whatever woman follows him on the succeeding

day, neither conveys herself nor her husband to Paradise!’ It is however to be observed, that no wife of a Brahmin can, under any circumstances, be permitted to burn, except upon the pile of her husband, which, as far as I can understand it, appears to be a device, by which the Brahmins would save as many of their own widows as they might be enabled to do, consistently with saving their own credit.

“These regulations as to infancy, and post-cremation, were accordingly added, by the authority of the British government, to the regulations which had preceded them, but, together with them, have been only adopted to be violated in unnumbered instances—the whole of the nine years’ annual returns being, in fact, little else than a collection of evidence on the violation of these very rules. To these may here be added, the notice of another point reported on by the Pundits, (vol. i. p. 29.) which was, that the widow might lawfully recede from her purpose, after mounting the pile, without losing caste, if the ceremonies were not begun, and even after they *were*, upon undergoing a severe penance; an attempt to legislate upon which opinion of the Pundits was also made by the legal court, and with equal success, defeat having almost invariably attended all such impotent and unhallowed expedients, as indeed could only have been anticipated by any men better qualified for legislating on such important subjects than the lawyers of the Bengal Court of Nizamut Adawlut.”—*Poynder*, pp. 25—27.

The author now proceeds to show, from abundant and convincing documents, derived from an experience of nine years, that these regulations have in various ways been decidedly injurious to their object, and have only contributed to increase the evil which they were undoubtedly intended gradually to abolish. His authorities are the opinions of magistrates, judges, collectors, civil and military officers, chaplains, &c. mostly extracted from the Parliamentary Report, and they are all so full and clear to the point that it is difficult to select from amongst them. One or two, however, we must offer.

“Mr. OAKELEY, the Magistrate of the Zillah Hooghly, by letter, addressed to the Superintendent of Police, Calcutta, dated 19th of December, 1818, says—

“‘Previous to 1813, no interference of the Police was authorized, and widows were sacrificed legally, or illegally, as it might happen: but the Hindoos were then aware that the Government regarded the custom with natural horror, and would do any thing short of direct prohibition to discourage, and gradually abolish it. The case is now altered. The police officers are ordered to interfere for the purpose of ascertaining that the ceremony is performed in conformity with the rules of the Shasters, and in that event, to allow its completion. This is granting the authority of Government for burning widows; and it can scarcely be a matter of astonishment that the number of sacrifices should be doubled, when the sanction of the ruling power is added to the recommendation of the Shaster.’”—*Poynder*, pp. 45—46.

“Mr. WARNER, the Magistrate of the Twenty-four Pergunnahs, by

letter to the acting Superintendent of Police in the Lower Provinces, dated in December, 1818, writes—

“ ‘ The police officer receives information from some part of the family, that the widow wishes to burn herself on the funeral pile of her husband :—he in consequence attends—a statement is drawn up, setting forth that the woman voluntarily devotes herself ; that there is no obvious objection, and that all is conducted in conformity to the orders of Government, and the Shasters. The consent is obtained evidently previous to information being given, and all the necessary preparations made. Supposing the woman wished to withdraw the consent already given, what time has she for it ? All is bustle and confusion—the poor creature suffering under the distress and agitation of mind caused by the recent death of her husband ; the corpse before her ; and the surrounding friends and relations calling upon her to devote herself ; praising her resolution, and pointing out the bliss declared to be awaiting her on the consummation of this act. Considering these circumstances, can it be wondered that so many instances occur ? Who are these women, and what opportunity has the Magistrate of ascertaining the real facts of the case ? The Suttce invariably takes place before the official inquiry is sent ; after its conclusion, who will come forward to point out any illegal act during the performance of the ceremony.’ ”—*Poynder*, p. 47.

“ SIR EVAN NEPEAN, the Governor ; and MR. BELL, and MR. WARREN, two of the Members of Council, concur with these views ; but MR. PRENDERGAST (who had before opposed the desire of the Governor to return the thanks of the Government to MR. HOCKLEY, the Magistrate, for a successful interference of that gentleman to save a life,) dissents ; so that here are Three Members of Council against the Prohibitory Regulations, while One only is in favour of their adoption.”—*Poynder*, p. 50.

To bring the matter home to the present time, we shall next insert the letter of a lieutenant of the 67th Regiment, lately arrived from India.

“ ‘ The two other Suttces on which I would remark, took place at Calcutta, in the month of June, 1826 ; and, from the spot where the scene occurred, one would imagine it was chosen just out of triumph, as it was on the banks of the river Hooghly, just opposite the palace of the Governor-General. I was paying a visit, at this time, to Principal Mill, at Bishop’s College, who, with some other clergymen, being anxious to prevent, by persuasion, so horrible a practice taking place, and particularly so near a Christian college, went to reason with the two poor women, in order to dissuade them, if possible, from their purpose, but without effect. They then argued with the mercenary and merciless Brahmins on the subject, but all their remonstrances upon the cruelty and sinfulness of such a procedure were in vain ; for the Brahmins only made this reply (which is their general one) and completely stopped their mouths, viz. ‘ It is our custom, and it is sanctioned by your laws—if we are wrong in a moral point of view, your laws are to blame for making this practice legal, and thereby showing that they approve of it as just

and right, and not cruel or sinful—so, if you have any complaint to make, or any thing further to say, don't trouble us, but go to your own magistrates and report to them.' This was the substance of their answer to Mr. Mill, and mentioned by him to me. And now, I will only say, that this just method of reasoning of the Brahmins speaks for itself, that, as long as this dreadful practice is sanctioned by our laws, it will assuredly continue, and, I fear, increase; and the Brahmins will have perpetual cause to exult, and throw the odium on our own laws for permitting that which we ourselves consider to be cruel, and in the sight of God, of a murderous nature, and which they, the Brahmins, know, in their consciences, to be evil, as they are often constrained to acknowledge in close argument. I have often heard this cruel practice spoken of by sensible men, long resident in India, who universally agree, that if it were made a capital offence by our laws, and a few examples made by the execution of offenders, (even were they Brahmins, as they chiefly are,) this evil custom would immediately cease to be practised throughout all India: and which would be only justly taking away the forfeited lives of a few, to save the lives of thousands. I fully agree in these opinions, though I cannot be so competent a judge as the persons alluded to, who have been so many years resident in India, and so perfectly acquainted with the nature and character of the Hindoos, of their religion and customs. As to the increase or decrease of the Suttee since the year 1823, (below which period it appears no official returns have been received at the India House,) I am sure that the practice is not on the decrease.

“ ‘ I enclose you a printed statement of the two women to whom I have alluded, who were burnt at Calcutta, in June last.

(*Copy.*)

“ ‘ Another of those truly execrable exhibitions, called Suttees, took place at Calcutta, on the 10th of June last, when two women were burnt with their deceased husbands. The sacrifice of the poor deluded victims was so far voluntary that they mounted the pile, only three or four feet high, and laid themselves down on the corpses; billets of wood were then thrown upon them; and our correspondent thinks that, from the weight and number of these, they could not have escaped, had they been desirous, on the fire reaching them. The pile was lighted by the eldest son throwing a billet of burning wood among its ready prepared combustibles. One of the women, who had a family, appeared to display the highest pleasure at the sacrifice, dancing, and making the most joyous noise of any one present. One or two of the female relations of the victims fainted on the pile being set fire to.’—*Calcutta Newspaper.*” — Poynder, pp. 113—116.

We pass over some strong cases of the guilt of the Brahmins and the indifference of the local authorities; we shall add one of peculiar horror, from the *Bombay Courier*, and reprinted in the *Parliamentary Papers*.

“ ‘ The unfortunate Brahminee of her own accord had ascended the funeral pile of her husband's bones, (which of itself renders the rite on

her part positively illegal,) 'but finding the torture of the fire more than she could bear, by a violent struggle, she threw herself from the flames, and tottering to a short distance, fell down: some gentlemen, who were present, immediately plunged her into the river, which was close by, and thereby saved her from being much burnt. She retained her senses completely, and complained of the badness of the pile, which she said, consumed her slowly, that she could not bear it, but expressed her willingness again to try it, if they would improve it: they would not do so, and the poor creature shrunk with dread from the flames, which were now burning most intensely, and refused to go on. When the inhuman relations saw this, they took her by the head and heels, and threw her into the fire, and held her there till they were driven away by the heat—they also took up large blocks of wood with which they struck her, in order to deprive her of her senses, but she again made her escape, and without any help, ran directly into the river. The people of her house followed her here, and tried to drown her, by pressing her under the water, but a gentleman who was present rescued her from them, and she immediately ran into his arms, and cried to him to save her. I arrived at the ground as they were bringing her this second time from the river, and I cannot describe to you the horror I felt, on seeing the mangled condition she was in: almost every inch of skin on her body had been burnt off; her legs and thighs, her arms and back, were completely raw; her breasts were dreadfully torn, and the skin hanging from them in threads; the skin and nails of her fingers had peeled wholly off, and were hanging to the back of her hands. In fact, I never saw, and never read of, so entire a picture of misery as this poor woman displayed. She seemed to dread being again taken to the fire, and called out to the 'Ocha Sahib!' as she feelingly denominated them, to save her. Her friends seemed no longer inclined to force her; and one of her relations, at our instigation, sat down beside her, and gave her some clothes, and told her they would not. We had her sent to the hospital, where every medical assistance was immediately given her, but without hope of her recovery. She lingered in the most excruciating pain for about twenty hours, and then died.'

"It may be proper to state, that the eye-witnesses, whose evidence is recorded, state, that three Brahmins were the parties who threw her into the fire, and that it was they who at first attempted to drown her, after she had escaped from the fire, and, before, they threw her on the flames a second time. They were her relations, which greatly aggravates their crime. Mr. Arbuthnot says, she was quite willing to put herself in the hands of strangers, and appeared grateful for the kindness shown to her."—*Poynder*, pp. 122—124.

"In 2384 cases of destruction out of 5425, occurring in the Bengal Presidency, no single observation whatever of the magistrate occurs, so that for any thing that appears to the contrary, the grossest contravention of the prohibitory regulations may have taken place in all of them. The instances *actually returned* where no officer whatever was present, are endless. The fines are generally merely nominal, and these are imposed without authority, for which infliction the magistrates are fre-

quently reprehended. The security taken for the future good conduct of ascertained murderers, is commonly as useless as that given for the maintenance of miserable infants; and neither the one nor the other appear to be ever enforced. The magistrates are, of course, above the law, and the Darogahs and other officers, however they may act, are quite as safe as their superiors, which cannot but be as well known to the natives as to themselves. In fact, the whole returns of these nine years are filled with cases of gross recorded cruelty and illegality."—*Poynder*, p. 127.

We are glad to close the evidence with the opinion of the Directors themselves, as it appears in their letter of the 17th June, 1823, signed by seventeen of their number, and addressed to the Governor-General.

“ ‘ To us’ (they observe) ‘ it appears very doubtful whether the measures which have been already taken have not tended rather to increase, than to diminish, the frequency of the practice. Such a tendency, at least, is not unnaturally ascribed to a regulation which, prohibiting a practice only in certain cases, appears to sanction it in all others. And it is to be apprehended, that where the people have not previously a very enthusiastic attachment to the custom, a law which shall explain to them the cases in which it ought not to be followed, may be taken as a direction for adopting it in all others.

“ ‘ It is, moreover, with much reluctance that we can consent to make the British Government, by a specific permission of the Suttee, an ostensible party to the sacrifice: we are averse also to the practice of making British Courts expounders and vindicators of the Hindoo Religion, when it leads to acts which, not less as legislators than as Christians, we abominate.’—vol. iii. p. 45.”—*Poynder*, pp. 128, 129.

In the answer of Lord Amherst, who was then almost new in the government, no hope is held out of any early cessation of the practice, under the operation of existing causes and of the existing regulations; but as the whole letter is not given, we are not disposed to dwell upon it. It would be wrong, however, to omit the important information, that four out of five judges of the court of Nizamut-Adawlut had then declared, after ten years' experience of the regulations, their opinions that it would be preferable to enact a regulation for the future prohibition of Suttees throughout the country. Their opinions are given at full length, with the reasons of them, in Mr. Poynder's speech, and we recommend them strongly to the reader's attention.

After some other observations, the author next proceeds to the second proposition, viz. That more can now be accomplished with perfect security to our Indian empire. The first argument on which he relies is an observation of a general nature, from the Parliamentary Papers, which we are unwilling to omit, that

“ ‘ There is no instance on historical record, in which acts of humanity have ever excited public indignation; massacre, confiscation, and

injustice, are the elements of revolution—not humanity, justice, and equity—the mere supposition is an anomaly in political science.— [Vol. iv. p. 26.]”—*Poynder*, p. 137.

But our readers will be better pleased to have some practical assurances of this truth from India itself, for which, however, we are compelled to refer them to the speech, assuring them at the same time, that nothing can be more decisive and satisfactory than the evidence produced.

We shall pass over much more pertinent matter and proceed to what we consider as most important, the answer to the objection that the abolition of the Suttees is an interference with the prejudices of the Hindoos.

“To this I answer, that the whole history of the British Empire in India, has been necessarily one incessant interference with the prejudices of the people, whenever it was obviously necessary for the purposes of our own government, and for the interests and happiness of the natives, that such interference should be exercised.

“In proof that prejudices long deemed invincible, have been completely overcome, we need only refer to the change introduced about thirty-five years since, by which the British Government granted to all classes of landholders an hereditary property in their estates—a privilege, till then, unknown in Asia; when the rents to be paid to government, which, as sovereign of the country, thus claimed to be proprietor of the soil throughout all India, were equitably and unalterably settled.

“Again—the most important reforms have taken place in the judicial system; and even in the military, the most confirmed principles and habits of a religious character have been often quietly overcome; and, in others, have fallen into disuse. Nay, things have already happened, even in our own times, which Sir W. JONES, however passionate a lover of liberty he was, dared not to anticipate, in the case of the natives, whom, with pain, he had, but a few years before, pronounced to be given up to an unmitigated and unalterable despotism.

“Perhaps I may add, without any breach of confidence, the testimony of Sir W. JONES’s biographer, Lord TEIGNMOUTH, who has lately assured me, that he never expected to live to behold the extraordinary improvement which has taken place in the religious, moral, and political condition of India, since his lordship was in office there.”—*Poynder*, p. 196.

Amongst the superstitious cruelties already invaded or abolished, may be mentioned the Sitting Dhurnah, Infanticide, and the exclusive privileges claimed by the Brahmins, from the operation of the laws.

It is time that we should close this review, but there is one point we had nearly forgot; a question touched upon by Lord Amherst, for the first time, as he states in his letter, viz. in what manner the proposed prohibition would affect the feelings of the native army. We are not surprised at this suggestion from Lord Amherst, which at first sight appears to involve matter of great

difficulty and delicacy; but it is a further proof, as appears to us, of what we are inclined to believe, that the Directors are much better judges of this matter than a Governor-General, whose opportunities and experience are comparatively so confined. Mr. Poynder's answer is very clear, and in substance this—if there had been danger from this quarter, it is not possible that the judges, magistrates and collectors, civil and military officers, and others living amongst them, and certain to be the first victims of the native soldiery in rebellion, should be insensible to it; and as they have never suggested such a difficulty, but on the contrary have reported so numerous and decidedly on the perfect ease and practicability of the abolition, it is to be presumed that no such danger exists. The fact seems to be this—the widows of the sepoys never burn; the native troops cannot but be aware of the accidents to which a soldier's life is liable, and love their children too well to encourage a practice which would leave them so often destitute; and as they have never rebelled in favour of inhumanity, so it is absurd to suppose that they would revolt from their allegiance, because the females of their own blood, their mothers and sisters, are to be denied the privilege of being burnt alive, a privilege, be it added, which they reject as concerns themselves.

Mr. Poynder has done his duty, and it remains for others to do theirs. The motion has been carried by a great majority. The principle, not of regulation, but of prohibition, has been solemnly adopted by those who have a right to call it into execution; and it remains only for the Directors to transmit, and the local authorities to act upon the instructions founded upon it. But this is not enough. We must remember that a wide expanse of ocean flows between England and India, and there is danger still that the voice which now strikes forcibly to our senses here, unless propagated again and again from this country, may fall faintly, and shortly die away upon the public ear in India.—Against this we must all in our several ways endeavour to provide, and we know no means more effectual than by watching the progress of the work, keeping up the attention of the public, and calling forth the expression of its opinion in all the channels through which it ought to be conveyed. The stain is national, and the desire and the effort to wash it away should be national too. We are not all indeed proprietors of East India Stock, nor responsible like those who are; but we are all Englishmen and Christians, and we have all a stake wherever British honour and Christian charity are at issue; and considering the manifold forms in which the question may appear, and the various places in which it may be discussed, there is scarcely one

of us who does not possess more or less influence, direct or indirect, in the determination of it. The House of Commons, a court, powerful and influential in whatever way it speaks, is accessible to all; it has already been employed upon the subject for many years, and to the labours of its Committee we are indebted for the valuable and extensive documents which Mr. Poynder's speech presents to us; and if Mr. Buxton, to whom the task was delegated, had not been struck with a severe illness at the moment he was preparing for the execution of it, the subject would have already been laid before Parliament in a more formal way. He will survive, we trust, to resume his humane labour early in the next session; but if Providence should determine otherwise, if this cause, in common with many others dear to humanity, should still continue to lament his loss, his place, we doubt not, will be supplied. Thanks be to God there is too much of Christian charity mingled with the intelligence and spirit and affluence of this favoured land, to suffer a doubt that other combatants will rise up in the same arena to combat in a cause which requires only to be fairly heard in order to succeed. Meanwhile, there will be no reason to regret the delay, if the interval should be employed in exciting earnestly the public attention to the subject, and diffusing a better and more accurate knowledge of it; and happy shall we be in the reflection, that it is in our power to contribute towards so excellent a purpose.

In making these observations we are very anxious not to be misunderstood. It is not the custom of our Review to clamour for rash reform—to interfere with established authorities—or to apply a general measure to cases not measurable by it; nor have we any temptation to alter our practice now. We are as strongly impressed as the Directors themselves can be, with the propriety and the necessity of exercising all practicable caution and forbearance towards the customs and prejudices of the natives, which seems to be matter of good faith as well as of good policy; and we are well aware how much the wisdom and even the humanity of every change is mixed up with the success of it. We applaud the Directors, who, holding in their hands the destinies of an awful empire, have chosen to explore and scrutinize carefully every step of their way before they advance in it; and we should be the last persons in the world, even if we were able, to goad them to measures dangerous to the security of a power wonderfully created, supported, and extended, to which we look with fondness and anxiety, not solely or mainly as the means of increasing the wealth and extending the commerce and the glory of this country, but as the instrument under God of diffusing widely the inestimable blessings of freedom, and knowledge,

and true religion amongst the myriads which own our sway. But being now perfectly convinced from all that we have heard and read, and particularly by the work before us, that the Directors have in this case carried their caution beyond the bounds of a sober prudence; that a bolder course is at once safe and honourable, and a bounden duty; and that the great majority of the Directors are disposed to be of the same opinion—we are anxious that the voice of the public may rise to them from every quarter, not for the purpose of compulsion and controul, but to give them courage and confidence in the course which they are willing to pursue,—that they may know and feel that in every temperate and resolute endeavour for the prohibition of this odious rite, they will carry with them the good wishes and the approbation of all that is intelligent and good amongst their countrymen; and that if hereafter, contrary to all probability and experience, this signal act of justice and humanity should excite nothing but the indignation and resistance of those for whose benefit it was framed; if when these deluded men awake from their frantic dream of bloody superstition to the god-like realities of charity and love, they should be ready to regret their former vileness, and to cry out “*pol me occidistis, amici,*” the Directors may retire with confidence upon the sympathies of their fellow-citizens, to console them for their error, and find that they who cheered them with their approbation when boldly venturing in the cause of humanity, will not refuse to share their disappointment when defeated. But there is no danger of such a termination. We know it has been lately urged by the Court, that the local authorities are the best judges of the time and the manner in which the prohibition should be brought about, and that to them accordingly it should be left. We do not question the good faith of the Directors in their perseverance in this plea, of which it is almost enough to say, that it has been already tried, and found to be futile and unavailing; but had it been a contrivance by which nothing should be done, and nobody be blamed, it would have admirably answered such a purpose; for while the Directors at home continue speciously to shift the burthen from their own shoulders, and every succeeding governor general in the exercise of his discretion has so many inquiries to make, so many people to consult, so many conflicting testimonies to reconcile, that he is usually superseded in his command before he has made up his mind what course he ought to pursue—no progress is made, nor can be made, in the work; and yet all is done that can be expected from such means. But it is neither fair nor wise to throw so much responsibility upon the local authorities—the Directors at home, who have the results of a large, and varied,

and successive experience to direct them, and a more comprehensive view of Indian policy, and more leisure to study it, are really better judges of the matter than the governor general, who frequently comes fresh to the subject; who has a world of other business upon his hands; whose first anxiety is to keep all things quiet, and who must depend for his information upon a council often changing, and upon the report of district magistrates, who having each a narrow sphere of action, and seeing the thing under different lights, must necessarily be divided in their opinions.* No; if the Directors wish in good earnest that this vote should be carried into effect, they must speak decisively themselves. Let the word go forth from this country fully, distinctly, and unequivocally pronounced; let prohibition be laid down and proposed to them, not as an ultimate end only dimly and fitfully seen at a distance, to be attained by dark and devious paths, but as a mark palpable, and practicable, and near, always kept in view and accessible by a course direct, undeviating, and intelligible. Some discretion, we are aware, must be permitted and exercised; some power of hastening or retarding the work, as circumstances may demand and prudence may direct; but at all events let there be no compromise with ungodliness—no countenance, either direct or indirect, on the part of the government—no furtive “bowing down in the house of Rimmon”—no “putting new wine into old bottles,” nor “sewing a piece of new cloth upon an old garment.” Let truth and religion spread their lights around them, that wisdom may be justified of her children, and her children be justified of it. But let not the work of humanity stand still, as they sometimes seem to wish, till this light shall fully shine upon them. This would be to reverse the natural order of things, and defer the consummation which we wish. Let them remember, that while such practices remain, they are themselves a strong barrier against the diffusion and prevalence of the Christian truth—and that the first forerunners of the Gospel preached repentance and the washing away of sin. It was thus that John the Baptist prepared the way of the Lord, and it is thus we must do it too, if we wish to be successful. These are the measures we would recommend; and if they be entered upon earnestly

* In this opinion we are confirmed by a great authority (Mr. Shore.) “If we consider the form of the British government in India,” says this gentleman, in a minute on the Bengal revenues, “we shall find it ill-calculated for the speedy introduction of improvement; the members composing it are in a constant state of fluctuation, and the period of their residence often expires before experience can be acquired or reduced to practice: official forms occupy a large portion of time, and the constant pressure of business leaves little leisure for study and reflection. True information is also procured with difficulty, because it is too often derived from mere practice, instead of being deduced from sound principles.

and sincerely, there is no fear whatever but that there will be found both power and disposition enough in the local authorities to carry them into effect. But if we still wait till every new governor general shall be ready to tread precisely, and promptly, in the steps of his predecessor, till all the local authorities are agreed, or till the last dark corners of cruelty and superstition in the breasts of the most knavish or the most ignorant of the natives shall be enlightened and purified; we may wait, perhaps, till by our passive acquiescence in the practice of cruelty and murder, we have accumulated such a weight of guilt upon our heads, as to make it consistent with the Divine Justice to visit upon us the punishment of it—till one of those convulsions arise in which the arm of Omnipotence is laid bare,

“ Quo bruta tellus et vaga flumina,
 Quo Styx, et invisi horrida Tænari
 Sedes, Atlanticusque finis
 Concutitur”—

till that lengthened chain which connects us with India shall be snapped asunder, and the godlike privilege now permitted to us, of diffusing the blessings of Christian peace and love over the vast empire of India, shall be torn from our sluggish hands as unworthy and insensible of it, and given to another.

We cannot in fairness close this subject, near, we confess, to our hearts, without adverting for a moment to one point of view, in which the means already employed may be regarded, and highly worthy of attention, as affording a striking proof of the advantage certain to be derived to the true interests of humanity, from open inquiry and discussion. Looking only to the direct and immediate consequences of the Regulations, and comparing them with their estimated results, we agree perfectly with Mr. Poynder, and indeed with the Directors, that they have not only failed of their object, but have been actually injurious to the cause, which they were intended to promote. By prohibiting the Suttee in certain cases, they have given, as it were, a sanction to it in others; and by making the Government a visible party to the sacrifice, they have afforded a sort of countenance to a practice, which, if not visited by their power or their punishment, ought always to have been marked with their honest indignation and dislike. But there is a brighter side to this picture, and those who love to look upon it will discover, that these measures have indirectly been productive of advantages which infinitely overbalance the mischief they may have caused. To them we owe entirely that full and ample report of nine years experience, which the Parliamentary Committee has made known to us, exhibiting, first, the real character of the rite; second, the cir-

cumstances with which it is usually preceded and accompanied; and thirdly, the weakness and the rottenness of the foundation on which it rests. To them we owe the concurring voice of so many judges, magistrates, and other officers, civil and military, testifying to the practicability and the facility of the prohibition. To them, in fine, we owe the success of the motion lately carried by Mr. Poynder in the Court of Proprietors, and the near prospect of that complete and entire triumph of humanity which it lays open to us. These are the real fruits of the Regulations, whatever share other agents may have subsequently had in bringing them to maturity: and, while we are grateful to Providence, which, by a beautiful display of its wisdom overruling the counsels of men, thus brings unexpectedly good out of evil, let us not be regardless of the lesson it conveys. Let us advance manfully in the track which it so evidently points out to us; and being ever mindful of the high responsibility which strange events have so unexpectedly thrown upon us, let us look mainly, in all our arrangements, to the permanent happiness and improvement of the natives, thus placed under our influence, and who have a right to look up to our care; being satisfied that while by these means we are seconding most effectually the benevolent designs of Heaven, we are at the same time consulting best for the peace of our own consciences, the honour of the British name, and the permanence and security of our empire.

ART. X.—*A Vindication of the Sentiments contained in a "Letter to a Clergyman on the Peculiar Tenets of the Present Day," in Answer to the Letters of the Rev. Mr. Whish, which were intended as a Reply to that Publication; comprising a more Ample Discussion of Various Important Subjects which have given rise to Controversy in the Church. To which is added an Appendix, containing a few Remarks addressed to another Antagonist.* By R. Bransby Cooper, Esq. M.P. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. pp. 450.

IT is impossible to contemplate such a work as that which is now before us without feelings of admiration and gratitude for a layman, and a member of parliament, who takes so deep an interest in the cause of religious truth, and is willing to exert himself so zealously in its propagation and defence; and there is a tone of moderation and good sense, as well as of piety, in Mr. Cooper's volume, which is not only highly creditable to him but redounds to the honour of the church of which he is a member. We ex-

tract a passage from the earlier portion of the work, in which the author combats one of the arguments adduced by his opponents in support of their favourite doctrine respecting the *total* corruption of mankind by the fall.

“ The next passage adduced by this gentleman in confirmation of his doctrine, is Gen. vi. 5. ‘ Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart are only evil continually.’ These words are applied to the state of man just before the deluge, and appear to me, instead of proving the total corruption of mankind by the fall, to be a very strong argument to the contrary. I have already observed that total corruption can admit of no degrees. It is from the first what it continues to the last, a state of superlative depravity, and therefore if this doctrine were true, there could have been no reason whatever for the destruction of the antediluvians at any particular time ; whereas the Scriptures tell us, that God waited till men had ‘ *corrupted themselves* ;’ till their ‘ wickedness had become great on the earth,’ and ‘ till every imagination of the thoughts of man’s heart was *only* evil continually,’ before He resolved to destroy them. His spirit had striven with man as long as there was a hope of his reformation ; but when he became wholly abandoned to evil, then, and not till then, was he swept from the face of the earth.

“ And here I think we are permitted to trace the goodness of God even in his severest judgments. He shows that He does not interfere without pointing out the grounds of his proceedings, as a warning to mankind in future, and for the vindication of His own glory, and the manifestation of His justice in this act of terrible vengeance. As before the destruction of Sodom He suffered Abraham to plead for the preservation of the righteous within it, till He promised that if He found ten righteous in the place, it should not be destroyed, so here, He shows, from the same condescension to the feelings of man, that until the universal progeny of Adam, with the exception of one family, had become completely vitiated and corrupt, notwithstanding the efforts of His Spirit, and the remonstrances of Noah to the contrary, He did not bring a flood upon the earth to purify it from its inhabitants.

Most of the other questions connected with the Calvinistic controversy are discussed with similar acuteness and success, and if it was necessary that Mr. Cooper’s reviewers should receive a detailed answer, we know not how it could have been conveyed to them in a better form than that which it has derived from the hands of the author himself. But we entertain serious doubts whether it was desirable that they should be answered at all. We think that the subject of them has been sufficiently discussed of late years, and that both parties will derive ease and benefit from a suspension of hostilities.

ART. XI.—*A Sermon, preached at the Ordination of His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York, held at Bishopsthorpe, July 2, 1826.* By the Rev. William Hett, M. A. of Jesus College, Cambridge. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 4to. pp. 32. 2s.

WE have been much surprised by this publication. The preacher reads a lecture to his brethren in the ministry, which, from its commanding air and ex-cathedra tone, might have suited an Archiepiscopal Charge. But his materials are not equal to his manner. Mr. Hett begins with condemning the divines who flourished about the beginning of the eighteenth century, for introducing “into their immortal productions” “more of the moral than the spiritual, of the ethical than the Christian, of the abstract than the plain;” and proceeds, without naming “the eminent men” of whom he is speaking, to attribute the rise and spread of Methodism to the general demand for a more spiritual mode of teaching. We do not concur in this opinion; but it has been held by many intelligent persons, and may be defended by many plausible arguments. In Mr. Hett’s discourse we find it for the first time in company with sentiments of so opposite a character, that we know not how both can be entertained at the same time by the same person. After a due proportion of common-place advice to the clergy as to their conduct in the capacity of neighbour and friend to their parishioners, the preacher proceeds to indoctrinate them on the subject of their studies; and having favoured us in his sermon with certain truisms upon the subject, we are presented, in a note, with a defence of German Divinity, and an attack upon Mr. Rose!! What can all this mean?—Is it consistent to censure the divines of the eighteenth century for rationalism, and then to take part with Semler and Rosenmüller?—Is it conceivable that a preacher who is desirous of raising the spiritual tone of our Church, should turn round and rebuke Mr. Rose and others for warning the inexperienced against philosophical Christianity? We answer by requesting attention to the following extracts:—

“Looking back, from the station at which time has placed us, upon the labours of those divines of our Church, who flourished about the beginning of the eighteenth century, we are enabled to account for that peculiar train of reasoning on subjects of religion, which distinguished their writings, and produced results that they little contemplated. Living at no great interval from the period when the nation had emerged from a revolting scene of rebellion and fanaticism, which led, on the one hand, to the excesses of a cynical enthusiasm; and, on the other, to the most daring heights of infidel speculation;—they had the arduous duty of combatting the subtleties of a Shaftesbury or a Hobbes, and of ex-

posing the popular, but almost equally pernicious, principles of the sectarian and the visionary. Their anxiety to refute the objections of their metaphysical opponents, united with a just disdain of mystical views of faith, drew them into a severe and abstract method, both of thinking and writing; which, while it excites admiration of their transcendent abilities, has left us to deplore the absence of that deep piety which ought ever to mingle itself in all the speculations of limited intellect upon the being, the will and the purposes of Supreme Intelligence. I mean not to affirm that this exception generally applies—far from it—there are passages in the works of these eminent men which discover, with a becoming prostration of reason, the most profound piety of sentiment. Candour, however, compels the acknowledgement, that in the pages of their immortal productions is found more of the moral than the spiritual, of the ethical than the Christian, of the abstract than the plain. This method of defending revelation, and enforcing its duties, obtaining, as it did obtain, among the ornaments of the Anglican Church at the period alluded to, gradually diffused itself among the inferior clergy; by a large proportion of whom a like method of instruction was adopted. The authority of what was eminent in rank and talent, exerted its wonted influence in swaying the practice of individuals less distinguished by learning and station. But neither exact method, nor soundness in doctrine, nor all the graces of style and composition, could compensate for the want of that spiritual information, and those views of religious experience which, in the judgment of many, constitute the chief excellency of public preaching. It was not surprising, if, impressed with the belief, that it was not by abstruse dissertations on points of faith and obedience, that the salvation revealed in the Gospel was best enforced—not by eloquent appeals to the understanding only, that the sinner was to be roused to a perception of his danger—nor by general assurances of pardon, however plainly stated, that comfort could be conveyed to the awakened conscience—men of ardent piety should have undertaken to remedy what they conceived to be a capital defect in the rational divines, and, by the introduction of a more serious strain of teaching, to remove what, with uncalled-for asperity, was denominated ‘the moralizing iniquity of the priest.’ Of those who joined in such an effort, many, there is reason to suppose, did it with due deliberation, and from the pure desire of serving the cause of vital Christianity: some, it is evident, rushed without thought into the most blamable excesses of unchastised zeal: while, in the case of others, it is not improbable, that with a considerable portion of sincerity were mixed up those workings of vanity and self-love, so inherent in our nature, and which too frequently entwine themselves around the best motives of even the best of men.”—pp. 7—9.

This is the text—now for the commentary.

“The Rev. Mr. Rose, in four sermons before the University of Cambridge (1825), has opened a formidable attack upon the modern German Divines. They are accused of having rejected the authority of the Scriptures, and of a departure from the sound and established rules of interpretation. These charges are drawn out in strong colouring in his text, and sustained in notes by extracts from the more popular of these

innovators, and by references to their writings. Among the Heresiarchs, Semler and Wegscheider, in particular, are singled out as objects of special animadversion; and, through them, the learning and critical labours of this school are denounced *en masse* as dangerous to the Orthodox Faith, as conferring on reason an undue importance, and as ultimately leading to the surrender of whatever is holy and peculiar in Christianity.

“These are heavy charges; nor would it be, on the supposition of their being true to the extent alleged, any extenuation to remark, that the same or similar accusations have been successively brought against Wickliff, against the Reformers almost generally, against Grotius, and in latter times, and in our own country, against Locke, Paley, Bishop Watson, and many others. But the fact, however, of charges of this kind having constantly been preferred by the Sciolists of the day against men of such eminence, and whose Christianity could not in truth be questioned, ought to restrain us from yielding to such imputations a too hasty assent. It is not enough to bring in proof detached passages selected from voluminous works, and to place them before the reader in an isolated form, nor to heap together authorities which the majority of readers have neither leisure nor abilities to consult. All this is easy; it is misleading; it carries away the judgment under the show of varied and compact evidence, which, if examined, might possibly be found insufficient and inconclusive. How long was Mr. Rose resident in Germany? Was it for any considerable time—for a year, or for a longer period? With how many of the retired, pains-taking, learned professors of that country did he actually converse on subjects upon which he has undertaken to pronounce with such confidence and certainty? The reader is undoubtedly led to the inference, that his visit to Germany was not a transient one, and that the opportunities he had of conferring with intelligent individuals upon the state of theological learning and opinions in that country were numerous, and favourable for eliciting truth. There is one circumstance, however, which goes in some measure to invalidate these suppositions; I mean his constantly referring his reader to periodical journals and biographical notices. One can hardly help suspecting that his information is not of that original kind and sterling character, which he would have us to think it is, when we find him expressing disappointment at not meeting in such a *profound* author as Chalmers with any mention of Semler. (p. 122.) In the notice taken of Semler and his heterodox principles, in the second sermon, which is the best of the four, some strong passages ought, in support of the assertions made, at page 50 in particular, to have been extracted from the works of that divine. But so far is this from being the case, that not a single quotation is produced.”

“I am not undertaking to deny that some of the modern German divines, and De Wette more particularly, have carried their system of interpretation to a dangerous extreme: still I augur that their extravagances will gain few converts, and that rational theology is destined, in the long run, to acquire even from their labours credit and stability. I would therefore recommend the young student not to give up, though

proscribed, or censured by Mr. Rose, Bishop Blomfield, or any other authority, his Schleusner, his Rosenmüller, his Kuinöel, or other works of high philological character, which have been produced by the learned of a country, which Mr. Rose himself hesitates not to place in the *first rank*, if not the *first in that rank*, of European nations. In stating this, I am aware that these authors occasionally indulge in comments and explanations calculated to do harm."—pp. 18—20. and 21—22, n.

The only key which we can discover to this mystery is contained in the following passage appended in italics to the note abovementioned.

"(I, of course, am solely responsible for this note, which I have been induced to print, not with any view to undervalue Mr. Rose's real talents and abilities, but from a wish to counteract the impression which the perusal of his discourses may have made on readers who have not been in the habit of consulting German authorities.)"—p. 22.

Does this mean that Mr. Hett has *not written*, but merely *been induced to print*, the defence of Semler and Belsham? If so, the world ought to know to whom it is indebted for that critique. If Mr. Hett is not only the printer and publisher, but likewise the author of the note in question, we may be pardoned for smiling at the modesty with which he warns us against following the advice of a Blomfield and a Rose.

We observe that this extraordinary production is inscribed to Archdeacon Wrangham.

ART. XII.—*Joseph separated from his Kindred, and from his native Land, to be a Ruler in a foreign Nation: a Sermon, preached in the Chapel of the Hon. the East India Company's College, Haileybury, at the Close of Term.* By the Rev. Professor Walter, B. D. & F. R. S., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; and Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Northumberland. London. Rivingtons. 1827. pp. 23. 1s. 6d.

THE education of young persons destined to fill the highest offices in British India, is a subject of immense importance, and we are confident that the public will be gratified by this specimen of the manner in which religious instruction is conveyed to the students at the East India College. We pass over a judicious commentary upon the History of Joseph, and introduce our readers at once to the application of that history, so happily conceived and so ably executed by Mr. Walter.

"You are summoned to be the instruments of a government which must seek for strength by deserving the approbation of its subjects; and which, therefore, expects its officers to save the weak from oppression,

and, like Joseph, to protect, by politic arrangements, an improvident population from famine.

“ And, in return, you also will find a submissive people, willing to receive you, as *lords of their houses and rulers of all their substance*. You cannot therefore reasonably repine, if your lot, on the other hand, again resemble his, in being severed from the home of youth—from parents affectionate like his—and perhaps too, like his, declining in the vale of years. And if, in that distant land, some one in your presence, a stranger to your deep interest in the name he utters, should speak of your father, from some recent knowledge of him; and of his having been, like Joseph's, exposed to trials endangering the exhaustion of his failing strength, with what swellings of heart will you also ask, *Is my father well, the old man of whom you spake? Is he yet alive?*

“ Do these thoughts occasion a painful anxiety? Learn from this story how to make an absent father happy.

“ In the hour of temptation, like Joseph, view with abhorrence, any proposal to violate a trust which has been generously and fully reposed.

“ Fear, like him, the consciousness of guilt, more than being exposed to the foulest calumnies. And if successful misrepresentation should, by some rare combination of circumstances, bring upon you disgrace and ill usage from those you had honourably served, how truly noble, how blessed would be the disposition, which should lead you, like him, to turn so faithfully to the duties of a humbler station, as there to win the confidence deserved before!

“ But the liberal encouragement which awaits your services offers (as I have already said) to your hopes a career more resembling that of Joseph in his prosperity. In such, learn, like him, to be at once provident for those entrusted to your charge, and careful for the honour and interests of those who delegate to you their power. That whilst the people gratefully exclaim, *Thou hast saved our lives*; they may also cheerfully say, *And we will be your countrymen's servants*. But remember, that even the saving their lives, will not secure their cheerful submission; unless, like the Egyptians, they be suffered to add, *Let us find grace in the sight of our master*. And that they may be convinced they do enjoy the favour of their governors, a courteous demeanour towards them will be no less requisite than substantial benefits. Like Joseph, you will be surrounded by people to whom many things, of no moment in your eyes, are *an abomination*. Learn from his example to pay due attention even to such prejudices.

“ Do these things; and I know not who shall forbid your gratifying a father's heart, by saying, in Joseph's words, to some friend returning home, *Ie shall tell my father of all my glory here, and of all that ye have seen*.

“ Thus shall a *wise son make a glad father*. And your praises, brought from a distant land, will be such *pleasant words*, as are *sweet to the soul, and health to the bones* of the aged.

“ Your reasonable expectations allow you to look forward to the happiest of all earthly rewards for your temporary separation from your native home.

“ Are the parents of any endowed less plentifully, than an affectionate son could wish, with the goods of this world? It may, after a few years of befitting economy, and proper exertion in your calling, be your delight to think, that the wants, to which age and its infirmities would give a double pressure, are changed, by help from your stores, into gratifications which make a parent's heart, like Jacob's, faint with overflowing joy.

“ Or, are your parents in affluence and honour? Still the world is but too disposed to change homage for slights, when the mind in old age is seen to be losing its vigour. And wealth cannot purchase back its full respect for declining influence. But if you so conduct yourselves as to return followed by the blessings of the nations amongst whom you have dwelt, and honoured by the praises of your countrymen, then, as the aged Jacob was revered at the king of Egypt's court for Joseph's sake; so shall your father meet with increased respect for yours—provided you do but set the example by that delicate attention, which is comprehended in the son of Sirach's pathetic exhortation.

“ ‘ *My son, help thy father in his age, and grieve him not as long as he liveth. And if his understanding fail, have patience with him; and despise him not when thou art in thy full strength. For the relieving of thy father shall not be forgotten; in the day of thine affliction it shall be remembered.*’

“ I willingly believe that the sweetest ingredient in the cup of earthly hopes, to each, is the idea that your elevation in life, or the improvement of your fortunes, will put it in your power to prove incontestably, how dear to you is a parent's happiness.

“ And may your feelings remain such, in all the warmth of their present youthful glow! But there is an evil which deadens all affection, with a far heavier chill than that of age. Indulgence in sensuality brings with it the barren curse of selfishness, to blight all virtuous, all generous thoughts; till the heart is so hardened under its withering influence, as to slight the calls of gratitude, and embitter the refusal with the laugh of scorn.

“ But whilst your hearts shudder at such a picture, whilst each would exclaim, if he were told the portrait would be his own, *Am I a dog, that I should do this detestable thing!* Let me beseech those, whose period of departure hence is not yet arrived, to reflect that the calls of gratitude cannot be less binding, whilst they remain under a parent's care, and eat his bread, than when they will be earning their own. That it cannot be less criminal to rack a father's bosom by neglecting his wishes, by violating his commands, by despising his entreaties, and persisting in idleness or misconduct *here*, than by the like cruel indifference to his happiness, when you are so far removed, that the disobedient answer, the unfeeling eye can no longer pierce his heart.

“ The wish, however, the virtuous wish, to provide means for increasing a parent's comforts—for enabling much loved relations to share your worldly advantages—might become a pretext for avarice—might degenerate into rapacity; if your filial affections had not another call.

“ You must remember, that you are the sons of Britain. And that peculiar forcible expression, our *mother* country, binds up within it every ardent, every kindly affection.

“ However removed, however estranged from the faces of your countrymen, if the mention of intelligence from your native land, after some long interval, comes across your ears, with what warmth of heart will you not ask, after the welfare of the old country of which they spake—*If peace be still within her walls, and prosperity within her palaces?*”

“ And this feeling should make you consider in every part of your conduct, how it will affect the character of your country? Its heart-stirring influence should make all, and every one, ready to sacrifice the most valued private objects, to earn for our nation this glorious homage; that *when the ear of the Indian hears a Briton, it shall bless him; and when the eye sees him, it shall give witness to him; as the deliverer of the poor that crieth—whilst he breaks the jaws of wickedness, and plucketh the spoil out of her teeth.*

“ But as the domestic affections may lead to injustice, the love of our country is still more likely to hide, from the patriot's self, the guilt of ambition; unless this feeling also be chastened by the constant remembrance that there is another still, and a weightier, claim for filial obedience and love—a claim which, if it was really felt as well as confessed, would correct and sanctify every motive of action—that there is an Almighty and All-righteous Being who deigns to name Himself our Father.

“ They in whom pride is strong, and affection weak, are apt to look forward to their independence of an earthly parent's bounty, as removing his claim to influence their conduct. But there is no escape, for those who could wish it, from dependence on our Heavenly Father's bounty.”—pp. 9—16.

The conclusion is written in a similar strain, but we have not room for its insertion here. Every Christian, and every patriot, must pray that Mr. Walter's advice may sink deep into the hearts of those to whom it is addressed.

ART. XIII.—1. *A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, March 25th, 1827, at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Robert, Lord Bishop of Bristol.* By Joseph Holden Pott, M. A. Archdeacon of London, and Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 4to. pp. 24. 2s.

2. *A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, July 15th, 1827, at the Consecration of the Honourable and Right Reverend Hugh Percy, D. D. Lord Bishop of Rochester.* By John Lonsdale, B. D. Fellow of Eton College, and Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. pp. 24. 1s. 6d.

THE chief subject of the first of these Discourses is ministerial intercession. Archdeacon Pott clearly proves the scriptural authority for the practice, and illustrates it by examples which are

familiar to every reader of the Bible. He proceeds to notice the gross abuses connected with it, which have crept into the Church of Rome, in the following terms :

“ But having pointed out the part which is allowed in this great work to those who are bound in all ways to succour others, impossible it is to lose sight of the manifest delusions which have led so many to betake themselves to other intercessors who have ceased to have their part in the common lot of those who tread together in one path of probation, who are utterly beyond the reach of our solicitations, and ill qualified to form the objects of that trust and confidence, or of those addresses which should be tendered to one only Righteous Mediator. During this scene of our common warfare, and in the joint course of our Christian fellowship and duty, each man is bound to help his brother in all ways possible, and, therefore, in the way of prayer, which is one effectual mode of succour : but if we extend this to another life, if we call those to our aid, of whom we must know that their presence everywhere to receive the suit, or to hear the invocation, must be implied in such addresses, we invest them at once with Divine prerogatives. There is no way to avoid the burden of that sacrilege, but by some imaginary fictions, invented when incautious flights of rhetoric had been indulged by some, (who yet, never surely bent the knee for such a purpose,) in celebrating the happy memories of martyred Confessors. Such strains of eloquence were turned at length in good earnest into devotional appeals. The next step was, that the presence everywhere, at least the power to receive all suits, was supported also by tales of miracles performed in answer to the suit which was put up. Thus another sole prerogative of God was as plainly given to the objects of such perilous addresses; and from this inevitable inference, there is still more difficulty to escape by subtle or ingenious pleas. If we venture, then, to address those removed from this scene of their faithful service, if we do but desire their prayers and intercessions at the throne of Grace, when we have a better Intercessor ever ready to receive our supplications and to promote our suit, we must take up with such subtle fancies as these following ; that the Saints may see things in the mirror of the Godhead, and by means of the beatific vision ; which, however, many of the Fathers utterly deny to be the privilege of any until the day of consummation shall arrive. Or, we must suppose that God, in some way, may reveal to them the wants of their respective rotaries, and then receive the prayer which is offered by their patrons. Wild and chimerical as such notions are, yet with such nice and dangerous subtleties is that whole practice of prayer to saints, though it be but in the way of invocation, salved and defended by its desperate abettors. But if all, or any, of such forced conceits, cease for a moment to be kept in mind, or are never known or understood by the bulk of those who pass their lives in the use of such devotions, then is that portion of God's incommunicable glory transferred without reserve. And what advantage can they reap who choose other intercessors, unknown for ages to the Christian Church, when to call upon the name of Christ, and to be a Christian, were terms of one import in the language of the Gospel, and shall be so

for ever, when these fond inventions shall find none to defend them."—*Pott*, pp. 10—13.

The effect of these errors in retarding the progress of the Gospel is pointed out with much eloquence.

“A sad thing it is to find that barren ages have been interposed in large portions of the habitable globe to check the progress of the Gospel. We stand amazed at it, and well we may, and take our part too in the blame. This pause was predicted, and much may it concern us to look well to the causes which may have operated to produce the sad result. We stand astonished at the plain fact, heart-stricken and disquieted, but can we fail to see what portion of impediment may well be traced to the palpable reproach and public scandal of needless, and to say the very least, of unprofitable and much-questioned usages, such as those to which I have alluded; and how many might be added! The poor Heathen sees them as plainly as he sees his own mis-shapen idol. He can retort the grave remonstrance which he may perhaps receive. The wily Bramin can make as nice distinctions, (nay the very same,) between superior and inferior objects of religious worship. It is easy to perceive what share this may have had in the sad suspense which has kept the welcome message of the Gospel so long from its enlargement, or has tended to diminish and impair its influence. If our own indolence, (for we must take our part in the common censure,) if our sordid love of gain shall have rendered us less ready to win men to the truth, than to court them to our traffic; if these drugs shall have contributed to produce the lethargy which has prevailed so long, let us not betake ourselves to mere apologies. If we stand clear of one gross burden of prevarication by which hypocrisy was linked with rapine, if we have not carried fire and steel in one hand, and rosaries and missals in the other, with the monstrous inconsistency of those who first visited the coasts of the western and the eastern world; let us wave this plea in our own behalf, and cast it from us, together with those mistaken policies which prudence when combined with zeal would annihilate at once. They have done so, blessed be God, in some measure; and if our prayers and intercessions for all men, which we put up daily, comprise the case and interest of the heathen, that they may be brought into the fold of Christ, let us add our sober, temperate, sincere, and unremitting efforts for their spiritual welfare. Most gladly can I offer these suggestions before those who sit, almost daily, in the chief seats of assemblies where such endeavours are employed, and where such means are devised.”—*Pott*, pp. 16—18.

Our readers will perceive from the foregoing extracts that the sermon of the truly venerable Archdeacon of London is enriched by that ecclesiastical lore with which the mind of the preacher is so amply stored; and if they entertain some doubts respecting the expediency of introducing controversy upon the subject here treated of into a consecration sermon, at least they must admit that all the leading points of that controversy are skilfully touched,

and a strong argument laid open for our instruction, by one who is thoroughly master of its details.

Mr. Lonsdale's Discourse does not depart so widely from the beaten, and, as we apprehend, the safer path, which is generally trodden upon similar occasions. But the elegance and precision of his language gives an air and charm of novelty, to what he himself modestly designates as topics with which we have been long familiar. The foundation of ministerial authority is solidly and properly laid in the divine appointment.

"It is our demand, as it was St. Paul's, that a 'man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.' If (we would say to our brethren of the laity) if we presented ourselves to your notice, like the philosophers of pagan antiquity, as self-commissioned teachers, venting upon the world the dreams of our own imaginations; or suggesting, for the guidance of our fellow creatures, the conclusions of our own judgements; you might be well justified in treating our representations with attention, or neglect, in 'hearing, or forbearing,' as might seem to you best. But such is not our character—such are not our pretensions. We come to you as the heralds of the Universal Sovereign—as conveying a gracious message of mercy and peace from God to his fallen creatures—as having 'a ministry of reconciliation committed to us.' 'We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.' In his name, we counsel, we exhort, we entreat, we charge you, to give us a favourable reception, and an attentive hearing. In a word, to sum up with St. Paul, 'we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.'

"There is the more need to press this consideration, because the absence of it from the minds of those to whom our ministry is addressed, is one great cause why that ministry fails of its due effect. If they would never lose sight of the authority by which we speak; if they would constantly bear in mind, that 'the word which they hear from us, is not ours, but His who sent us,' there would not surely be so much languor in the attention with which it is received, or so little fruit resulting from our labours. Would to God, that it might never be forgotten, that our commission is not the less certainly divine, because it is evidenced to be such, by moral, and not sensible proofs: and that its validity cannot possibly be impaired by any personal defects of the commissioners! Would to God that we might have full reason to apply to our brethren the Apostle's eucharistical language, 'For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God; which effectually worketh also in you that believe!'"—*Lonsdale*, pp. 11—13.

An old but popular objection to the Established Church is met and answered with great spirit.

"But it is charged against us, that we aspire to other dignity, than

that which belongs to us 'as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God;' that we are ambitious of other honour than that to which we are entitled by virtue of our divine commission. It is true, that, as exercising our holy calling in the world; (and our Master himself expressly disclaimed the desire that his chosen ones should be 'taken out of the world;') as being persuaded too, that a general, though cautious and restrained, intercourse with it is essentially requisite to give full scope to our usefulness; we do seek such a station there, as may facilitate our access, and recommend our ministry, to all classes of society; for it is, for the benefit of all that we have received our charge. And since it is mere idleness, or something worse, to draw a strict comparison between present circumstances and those of the Apostolic age, we would appeal to the thinking, and the wise, whether that object be most likely to be attained, in a state of highly advanced civilization like ours, by the assignment of a depressed condition and bare maintenance to the clergy; or of such an honourable rank, and competent provision, as, while it enables them to stand unabashed in the presence of the highest, may at the same time not disqualify them for free and kindly converse with the lowest. It is true too, that we claim for a few of our order a place even among the nobles of the realm: but we claim it for them, only that they may thereby be empowered more effectually to promote the spiritual interests of that Church, in which they bear rule, and which looks to them as, under her divine Head, the chief instruments of her support and guardianship. We do not forget (it would be strange, indeed, if we did) that Christ's 'kingdom is not of this world,' often as the plain sense of that saying has been perverted: but we remember also, that it is a kingdom of grace upon earth, before it becomes a kingdom of glory in heaven: and that, while it continues such, earthly means may, and ought to be employed, for the enlargement of its boundaries, and the extension of its benefits. God forbid, however, that, while we are intent upon the means, we should lose sight of the end which hallows them; and should mistake the mere outworks of our Sion, for the heaven-built citadel of its strength! Woe, we are well assured, awaits the secularized minister, who is content to merge in temporal distinctions the title, in which his pattern, St. Paul, gloried, of a 'servant of Jesus Christ.' And if we would learn that God's hand is against the Church which pursues worldly splendour and political aggrandizement, at the expense of its true honour, the public annals of Christendom may supersede the necessity of other teachers."—*Lonsdale*, pp. 13—16.

The practical inference from the whole is very beautiful and very impressive.

"To what then, that we may come to the conclusion of the whole matter, to what have they, who have 'taken part in this ministry,' solemnly engaged themselves? Let us hear the inspired teacher once again. 'It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.' It is not a point of counsel, not a matter of recommendation; but of strict and positive requisition. Fidelity is not only the proper, but the indispensable qualification of stewards in general; and of the stewards of

God's mysteries above all others: and it is the praise specially assigned to certain eminent individuals among them in several places of Scripture. In other qualities, there may be a difference among them; they may, they will, vary in ability; for some have the loan of ten talents, and some of five—they may vary even in zeal and activity—for in determining the measure of these, constitution of body and mind will have its weight—they may vary in usefulness—for this will depend greatly upon the spheres and opportunities of acting, which may severally be assigned to them. But faithful they must all be: faithful in their attachment to their Master's interests; in their zeal for his glory; in their maintenance of his cause; in their care of his household; in their distribution of his riches. It would not be a difficult, though an unwelcome task, to point out the ways in which God's stewards may be unfaithful. They may administer the spiritual treasure committed to them partially; giving only such measure of it as suits their private purposes, and withholding the rest. Let the Church of Rome consider how much she has to answer for in this respect. They may mix their own dross with the pure gold of the sanctuary, and dispense both together as of common origin, and of equal value. Here, too, the same Church has incurred a charge, heavier than we would willingly lay upon its individual members. They may at least dwell with undue preference upon the importance of certain portions of that precious deposit, and so lead men to make a false estimate of the whole. And here, need we go far for examples of failure?—But I forbear. Let us rather seek for ourselves, by every appointed means of grace, the will and the power to be faithful, from Him who is the author of both. There cannot be a stronger claim to the charitable prayers of those among whom we minister, on our behalf, than the consideration, that we are appointed to 'watch for their souls, as they that, (by the very nature of their office) must give account.' There cannot be a more heart-stirring incitement to our own earnest supplications, and diligent endeavours, than the constant bearing in mind of the awful summons which awaits us, 'Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward.'"—*Lonsdale*, pp. 19—22.

It is impossible to lay down this Discourse without feeling an earnest desire that the preacher may lose no time in realising the expectations which it is calculated to incite. The purity of Mr. Lonsdale's taste, and the soundness of his opinions are already well known to those who have read the occasional sermons which he has submitted, from time to time, to the public. It remains for him to exhibit in a wider field the fruits of that critical acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, and that comprehensive theological learning, in which, unless we are very much mistaken, he may rank with the brightest ornaments of the Church.

ART. XIV.—*On the Importance of giving Religious Instruction to the Slave Population in the West Indies: a Sermon, preached at the Cathedral and Parish Church of St. Michael, Barbados, on Sunday, the 11th of February, 1827. By Edward Eliot, B.D. Archdeacon of Barbados. Bridge-Town. 1827. pp. 40.*

THAT the publication of this discourse should have been desired by some of the leading inhabitants of Barbados, must be considered as creditable to them as it is encouraging to the West India clergy; for Archdeacon Eliot has spoken with great plainness upon points which are unhappily still disputed even in Barbados. His sermon is not a mere discourse of compliment, but he remonstrates strongly with the planters for their continued unwillingness to allow of instruction in reading and writing, and reproaches them with their inferiority in this respect to other West Indian settlements.

“ I believe no one will deny, that the Holy Scriptures, and also the Liturgy of our Church, are of the highest importance in giving the knowledge which a Christian ought to possess, and in producing the conduct which a Christian ought to maintain. But it is useless to direct a person to these invaluable treasures, while we withhold from him the key by which alone he can obtain them—it is useless to tell him to ‘ search the Scriptures,’ while we debar him from reading the Scriptures. I have great satisfaction in knowing, that in this island there are persons of large estates, and of the greatest respectability, who fully concur in this opinion; and from a conviction of the ultimate benefit attending the measure, they already have begun, and they are most anxious still further to promote, by every means in their power, the instruction of their slaves in *reading* the word of God, and the excellent services of our Church.

“ Instruction to this extent, and on a regular system, I allow is new in Barbados; but its importance is not diminished on this account. What may be regarded as almost an experiment here, has been already practised, and practised with no small success, in some of the neighbouring islands; and it would ill become this colony, at once the most ancient, and, from various causes, the most prominent in the West Indies, to be the last in adopting measures calculated to promote no less the worldly interests of the master, than the spiritual and eternal welfare of the servant—ill would it become this colony to be backward in *any* righteous work, or to shrink from a comparison in *any part* of its religious progress with countries similarly situated as to society, and perhaps inferior to it in the means possessed for extended improvement.”—pp. 16—18.

The impossibility of granting any further indulgence to the fears which may be entertained upon this subject, ought to be distinctly stated to every one connected with the colonies. The education of the Negroes is no longer an experiment; it has been

tried, and has succeeded. And we feel convinced, that the firm and decided manner in which Archdeacon Eliot has expressed himself, will be considered honourable to himself and to the Church. While “an unwillingness still prevails to allow the Negroes to be taught to read the Word of God,” (p. 39,) the West Indians continue exposed to just reprehension. And he is their best friend who tells them so unequivocally and loudly. The Archdeacon’s argument is unanswerable, and we hope soon to hear that it has produced the effect which may be expected from it.

“I might direct your attention to the improved character of the lower orders of society in the mother country; but as the poor in England, though in a station analogous to that of the slave population in this part of the world, differ, however, from them in some important particulars, their case may not be considered conclusive on the subject. I need not, however, go beyond the limits of the West Indies. In every colony, and indeed on every estate, where the religious instruction of the Negro has been encouraged, the advantages resulting from it have been in every way most important. Nor is it to the British islands alone that I would confine this remark. The interest which I have taken in the religious improvement of this part of our population, has led me to extend my inquiries to the spiritual state of the colonies under other governments besides our own; and the result has been an entire conviction, that the more widely the doctrines of Christ have been diffused among the slave inhabitants, the greater has been the improvement in their moral habits, and in the performance of all the duties connected with their condition. It has been publicly stated, more than once, with reference to these foreign islands, that their baptized and instructed Negroes are a greater security to them than even their fortifications; and the inhabitants admit, that a Christian Slave is always held in much higher estimation than one who has been left in a state of heathenish ignorance. We are also told, with respect to one of these colonies, that previously to the system of religious instruction now so general there, a spirit of insubordination prevailed, and that it led to violence, and bloodshed, and every species of outrage; but that since the introduction and diffusion of Christianity among the Negroes, the colony has never suffered from similar disturbances. This indeed is an effect, which, antecedently to the fact, we might naturally have expected. The precepts of Christ not only discourage opposition to established authority, but they enjoin throughout a ready and cheerful obedience to it.

“Should it be asked, in what way, and to what extent, religious instruction should be given? the answer is not difficult. The proper *manner* of conveying it has been already recommended to you by the head of our Church establishment in this part of the world; and I am happy to say, that his suggestions have thus far obtained the sanction and avowed concurrence of the most respectable inhabitants of the land. The proposed instruction is given through the medium of authorized and responsible teachers, whose qualifications are previously ascertained by the Bishop himself; and who are expressly directed to visit plantations,

or other places, at such times only as shall have been agreed on between the rector of the parish and the respective proprietors. These teachers have no authority of their own. They act only by the instructions and immediate direction of the minister of the parish in which they are employed; and the required concurrence of the master is calculated to impress on his servants, that *he* is the channel through which they are to receive their spiritual, no less than their temporal blessings. It is through catechists thus appointed, and also through parochial and Sunday schoolmasters, equally under episcopal control, that the offer is made of affording religious knowledge to the slave population of this diocese; and it would be difficult to imagine a more effectual way of guarding against the possibility of any evil arising from improper motives or misguided zeal. Every security that the master can require is here afforded him; and if he objects to a plan of instruction so well furnished with every necessary safeguard, it must be from other, and perhaps less excusable motives than the apprehension of danger.”—pp. 11—15.

ART. XV.—*A Visitation Sermon, preached at Northampton, on Monday, July 16, 1827, before the Right Rev. Herbert Marsh, D. D. Lord Bishop of Peterborough. By the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, M.A. Rector of Brington, Northamptonshire, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Chester. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. pp. 20. 1s.*

THIS is a plain discourse upon the duties and encouragements of the clergy, and it is delightful to perceive so much fervent and sober piety engaged in spreading correct views of Christian dispensation. The following passage from the latter part of the sermon will put our readers in possession of a fair specimen of Mr. Spencer's manner.

“And why will the Lord send none to feed his flock who do not love him? because they alone will truly love the sheep. They have a motive within them which constraineth them to unremitting cheerful diligence; a motive, of which those know not the power, who have not themselves been led to flee for life to that Saviour, who loved them and gave himself for them. But when once a man has come to the knowledge of his lost and miserable state, and hath found hope and comfort by reliance on his Redeemer, he will most gladly spend and be spent in his service. He perceives and rejoices in the love of God, in that he laid down his life for him, and now with hearty willing zeal acknowledges the obligation that he ought to lay down his life for the brethren. He is bought with a price; he is not his own, and therefore henceforth lives not to himself, but to the Lord. If we then, my brethren, desire that to us ministers, the yoke of Christ should be easy, and his burden light, let us learn more of the burden of our own iniquities. If we can see clearly, from what a weight of wrath he hath redeemed us, we cannot reckon his commandments grievous.

“ 2. But a willing mind is not enough. We must also learn the right way and means to do this work of saving souls, or we shall yet be useless pastors. And here let us remember, that without Christ we can do nothing. The salvation and edification of his Church is his own work; we are but instruments in his hands. But then we are instruments appointed by him, and he has promised that to the end of the world, he will always be with us to strengthen us. The conversion of one sinner is above the reach of man's ability or wisdom. For in attempting it, we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against spirits of wickedness, who will do their worst to defeat us. But if we be Christ's, greater is he that is with us, than he which is against us. God will make us to triumph; for those things which are impossible with man, are possible with God; and they who trust in him shall never be confounded.

“ Since, then, it is by humble faith in the power and the help of God, that we shall be made superior to the great enemy of souls, and be enabled to labour successfully for their salvation, let us consider what will be the fruits of this faith, that we may judge whether it exists in our hearts.

“ In the first place it will make us bold and dauntless. Resting upon his everlasting arms, we shall not dread the anger and opposition of his adversaries. If need be, we shall willingly ‘ endure hardness, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ,’ because we know that our pains, or dangers, or afflictions, will be overruled to the furtherance of the Gospel which we love. Secondly, it will make us persevering: though for a while we may seem to lose our labours, we shall not be discouraged. We shall be patient and long-suffering, knowing that ‘ in due time we shall reap if we faint not.’ We may find that to some, the Gospel which we preach will be ‘ a stumbling-block,’ and they will hate its humiliating doctrines; to some it will be ‘ foolishness,’ and they will deride it; yet to many it shall prove ‘ the power of God unto salvation,’ and we are taught to look forward to a time when it shall universally prevail. Having a firm conviction of this upon our minds, we shall continue to preach the Word through evil report and good report; we shall still reprove with unwearied gentleness those that oppose themselves, if peradventure, after all hope seems past, ‘ God will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth.’

“ But as faith will make us fearless and persevering, where we ought to speak, it will also make us discreet, and humble-minded, and unobtrusive. ‘ If a man strive for the mastery,’ says St. Paul to Timothy, alluding to the athletic games of Greece, ‘ he will not be crowned, except he strive lawfully,’ or according to the appointed rules: so the minister who hath looked to God for strength, and knows that from him alone must come success, will not expect it, if he overstep the line which has been marked out for him. Ready as he will be to use with boldness every lawful opportunity, he will not wish nor dare to speak, except where and when the Lord permits; and considering that it is God who assigns to one or another their sphere of action, as he judges fit, he will neither intrude uncalled into the rightful provinces of others, nor discre-

gard the rules and ordinances, to the observance of which the authorities of the Church lawfully oblige him. 'God is not the author of confusion, but of peace,' and order, and harmony. When we transgress our proper limits, we are not sent by him, and must not expect to prosper.

"Must a minister be idle then, it will be asked, and confine his labours to a narrow sphere, when he might do more? We shall not fear being reduced to this, if we have a true conception of the power of him, to whom all things in heaven and earth do bow and obey. If we know him whom we serve, we know that he can give us opportunities, according as he sees us fit to use them. Only let us be working patiently and faithfully in our appointed place, and then, in due time, the Lord will give us more ability, and enlarge the measure of the field on which we may exert it.

"And as the minister who trusts in God, will fight only in that post which his Lord hath assigned to him, he will use only that weapon of attack which his Lord hath put into his hands; even 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.' His Word applied to the heart by the operation of his grace, is the appointed means by which men are turned 'from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God.' Knowing, therefore, that this weapon is 'quick and powerful,' and that all others are weak, and will not stand, the faithful minister will consider it all-sufficient. His delight will be in the testimonies of God; in them will he exercise himself day and night, for by them his God makes him stronger than his enemies. To the better understanding of them, will all his other studies lead; he will contemplate the examples of God's servants recorded there, and by them he will fashion both the manner of his life and the tenour of his doctrine."—pp. 14—19.

ART. XVI.—*An Inquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John, has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years.* By S. R. Maitland, Perpetual Curate of Christ-Church, Gloucester. London. Hatchard and Son. 1826. pp. 86. 3s.

HAVING recently entered at considerable length into the merits of the Apocalyptic writers, we do not purpose to resume the subject in the present notice of Mr. Maitland's pamphlet. He has undertaken, and accomplished, the very useful task of pointing out a few of the discrepancies and inconsistencies of the self-denominated interpreters of unfulfilled prophecy; and, without offering any scheme of his own has shown most conclusively that their schemes are unsatisfactory. We extract the eloquent and judicious peroration, and recommend it to the particular attention of Mr. Frere, Mr. Irving, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Croly.

"We can, and we do, look to fulfilled prophecy as a bulwark of our faith. After the prophet had said, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a child,' ages rolled on; and while it was still future, we know

not how much, or by how many, it was understood : but we know, that when ‘ the fulness of the time was come,’ and the prediction was accomplished, the Church of God was not suffered to remain in darkness—she was not left to wander up and down, asking ‘ Is this He that should come, or look we for another?’ No—from the day of Simeon to this hour her joyful acclamation hath been, ‘ Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given,’—her steady eye has never turned from the bright star of hope and promise that first led her to Bethlehem—her unwavering faith has been, that he was despised and rejected of men, and that they hid as it were their faces from him ; her well-authenticated records attest, as matters of history, how all they that saw him laughed him to scorn—that they pierced his hands and his feet—that they parted his garments among them, and on his vesture they cast lots—that they gave him vinegar to drink. His disciples know well, when, and how, he was numbered with transgressors, and how his grave was made with the wicked and with the rich in his death.

“ But there is no need to argue this matter—we point the infidel to the captive Jew, and the wandering Arab ; but who challenges him with the slain witnesses ? We set before him the predicted triumphs of Cyrus ; but do we expect his conversion from the French Revolution and the conquests of Napoleon ? We send him to muse on the ruined city of David, and to search for the desolate scite of Babylon ; but who builds his argument on the opened seals of the Apocalypse ? And why is this ! I do not speak hastily, and I would not speak uncharitably—but I cannot suppress my conviction, that it is because the necessity of filling up a period of 1260 years, has led to such forced interpretation of language, and to such a constrained acquiescence in what is unsatisfactory to sound judgment, that we should be afraid not only of incurring his ridicule, but of his claiming the same license, which we have ourselves been obliged to assume. I firmly believe that the error lies, in adopting an interpretation, which requires us to spread the events predicted respecting three years and a half, over more than twelve centuries ; and which thus sends us to search the page of history for the accomplishment of prophecies still unfulfilled. The importance of rectifying such an error, if it exists, will be admitted by all ; and the question of its existence, is that which I wish to see investigated. I therefore beg the reader, whom I would willingly suppose to prefer truth to system to examine the prophecies in question ; endeavouring, for the time, to forget whatever he may know of the various interpretations which have been offered : and may He, who is the Author and Giver of every good and perfect gift, grant to him, and to myself, by his grace and his Spirit, a right judgment to understand, and a true faith to believe, whatever he has seen fit to reveal in his most holy Word !” —pp. 83—85.

ERRATA IN OUR LAST NUMBER.

Page 16, line 12, for "660," read "606."

12, 13, for "the Popedom was destroyed A.D. 1792," read
"the Popedom would be destroyed A.D. 1866."

17 . . . 35, for "was," read "contained."

With reference to the preceding errata, and some other alleged misrepresentations of his opinions, we have received the following remonstrance from Mr. Faber.

"SIR,—In the review of *Apocalyptic Writers*, contained in the *British Critic* for July, 1827, you have done me the honour more than once to introduce my own name. It is perfectly reasonable that an author should bear the blame of whatever he *has* maintained; but it is somewhat unfair that he should be censured for opinions, which he *has never* avowed, and which, in truth, he *utterly disclaims*. Now, as no honourable man would be guilty of wilful misrepresentation, and as therefore I feel persuaded that the misrepresentation to which you have subjected me has arisen from inadvertence, I doubt not that you will do both yourself and me justice by an insertion of the present communication in your next Number.

"I. Speaking of the date of the 1260 years, you say, 'Mr. Faber prefers the year 660, supposing, at the time he wrote, that the Popedom was destroyed A. D. 1792.'—p. 16.

"The date, which I conjecturally specified, was the year 606. Very probably I was mistaken: but, at all events, I neither mentioned the year 660; nor did I ever dream that the Popedom was destroyed A. D. 1792.

"II. You assert, that the sole fundamental principle of a class of commentators, in which you place Mr. Faber, is, 'that the Pope or Church of Rome is that Antichrist, whose duration is limited to 1260 years.'—p. 16.

"I have devoted a whole chapter, specially to prove that the Pope or Church of Rome is *not* Antichrist: and, for this purpose, I quote the identical text of St. John quoted by yourself—'He is the Antichrist, who denieth both the Father and the Son;' whence I infer, like yourself, the impropriety, or (as I more strongly express myself) the impossibility, 'of applying the title of the Antichrist to a Church, or to its head, which confessedly maintains every fundamental article of the Christian Faith.'—p. 17.

"III. You represent me as improving upon Brightman: for, whereas that commentator 'applied *many* of the visions of St. John to the events of his own age, Mr. Faber improved on the hint, and persuaded himself, that *the Book* of the Revelations (qu. Revelation) was an exact prophetic commentary of the French Revolution.'—p. 17.

"Assuredly I never persuaded myself of any such gross absurdity. On the contrary, with Mede and Newton, I supposed the Apocalypse to be a chronological prophecy, extending from the Apostolic age to the final consummation of all things. Agreeably to this view of the question, I applied, in chronological order, a *very small part* of the Apocalypse to the French Revolution. Probably I may be wrong in my *speculation*: but still, as a *mere matter of fact*, I state what I actually *did*; and which most certainly is *the very reverse* of what you ascribe to me.

"Permit me to repeat, that I am willing to bear the blame of what I *have* said, but that I deem it somewhat hard to be saddled with impertinencies

which I *never* promulgated. I have always shown myself ready to retract my errors; and I would most freely retract those which you have ascribed to me, had I ever uttered them. But the truth is, as any person may satisfy himself merely by reading my work, I *never* maintained the justly reprehensible errors in question; and I must confess myself to be not a little astonished, that you should have exhibited them as *my* property.

“Fully trusting that you will do me that justice which is only due from man to man, I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your obedient Servant,

G. S. FABER.”

“July 6, 1827.”

We shall notice Mr. Faber's objections as they stand.

I. The date of 1792, fixed for the termination of the Papal persecuting power, is Mr. Irving's, who states its commencement A. D. 533. We attributed it to Mr. Faber by mistake. His calculation, if we understand him, would terminate the period A. D. 1866.

II. Mr. Faber unquestionably belongs to that class of commentators who limit the duration of the Pope, or Church of Rome, as a persecuting power, to the period of 1260 years. *That* is the master error, which we are there combatting. The other commentators, with whom we classed him, maintained the Pope to be Antichrist. This Mr. Faber denies: but he agrees with them in limiting the duration of his power to 1260 years. This is the main pillar of all their systems; and when this is removed the whole fabric falls to the ground. Time has ruined the calculations of the rest; and Mr. Faber, we suspect, has already lived long enough to discover the fallacy of his own.

III. We never meant to say, that Mr. Faber applied the *entire* Apocalypse to the French Revolution. We should have expressed ourselves with greater accuracy had we said, that “Mr. Faber persuaded himself that the Book of Revelation *contained* an exact prophecy of the Revolution.”

Mr. Faber does us no more than justice, in supposing that we have not wilfully misrepresented him; and, with the exception of those mistakes, which are palpable oversights, he has small ground of complaint against us. We charged him with limiting the duration of the Papacy to 1260 years; and he has done so. We said he thought he had discovered the French Revolution in the Apocalypse; and he says so too.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS

RESPECTING THE CHURCH.

UNITARIAN MARRIAGE BILL.

A BILL, (as amended by the House of Lords,) intituled, An Act for granting Relief to certain Persons dissenting from the Church of England, in respect of the Mode of celebrating Marriage.

WHEREAS it is expedient to make provision for the Marriage of the members of certain congregations of Protestant Dissenters, usually assembling for divine worship in certain chapels or places duly entered and registered according to law, who deny the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is declared in the Articles of Religion mentioned in the Statute made in the thirteenth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and who therefore scruple to be married according to the office of matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer: Be it therefore enacted, by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, That at any time after the passing of this Act, whenever the banns of marriage shall have been duly published three several Sundays in the proper parish church or churches, chapel or chapels, as required by law, between any two persons, being members of any such congregation as aforesaid, who shall be desirous of having the benefit of this Act, without just cause or impediment having been declared against such marriage, it shall be lawful for the rector, vicar, curate, or officiating minister of each and every parish or chapelry in which such banns of marriage shall have been published, and he is hereby directed and required to give a certificate, in writing, under his hand, certifying the due publication of such banns, and that no cause or just impediment had been declared why the parties should not be joined together in matrimony, such certificate being in the form specified in the Schedule to this Act, marked (B.), with such variations as circumstances shall require: Provided nevertheless, that both the parties shall previously sign a declaration in writing, in the form specified in the Schedule to this Act, marked (A.), with such variations as circumstances may require; and such declaration shall be also certified and attested, in the form specified in the said Schedule, by the officiating minister of such congregation, if any such there be; and also by two elders of the same congregation, being housekeepers; and in case there be no officiating minister, then by three elders of the same congregations, being housekeepers; and in which declaration and certificate the place of abode, and also the state, profession, or trade, of every person signing the same, or therein mentioned, shall be truly set forth: Provided also, that previously to giving such certificate as aforesaid, the rector, vicar, curate, or officiating minister

and clerk of the parish or chapelry in which the woman intending to be married shall be resident, shall be entitled to and shall receive from the party applying for such certificate, such and the same fees, duties, and emoluments, as might by law or custom be demanded for publishing such banns and solemnizing such marriage in the parish church or chapel of such parish or chapelry.

And be it further enacted, That it shall and may be lawful to and for such persons so proposing to intermarry as aforesaid, or any person on their behalf, to carry such certificate or certificates of the publication of banns, or their license, in case the marriage shall be had by license, and to leave the same, together with the said declaration, and certificate thereto subscribed, or another declaration and certificate, in the same form, and signed as aforesaid, with any justice of the peace, mayor, alderman, or magistrate, authorized by law to act as a justice of the peace within the division, city, borough, or corporate town or place wherein the said parties or either of them reside; and such justice, mayor, alderman, or magistrate, not being a clerk in holy orders, shall and is hereby required thereupon to name and appoint a time, within the hours appointed by law for the celebration of marriages, and not at a less distance than the second day thereafter, nor a greater distance than four days from the receipt of such certificate or license and declaration, and certificate thereto subscribed, at which time, and at some suitable and convenient place to be also appointed by such justice, mayor, alderman, or magistrate, the parties so proposing to intermarry shall and may appear; and such justice, mayor, alderman, or magistrate, is hereby required and authorized thereupon to attend and take the declaration of the contracting of marriage, and to permit such parties to intermarry before him in the presence of such witnesses as are required by law for the celebration of marriages; which marriage, as to the form thereof, shall be had and declared in manner and according to the form following: the man to be married, taking the woman to be married by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words,—

“ I *A. B.* do take and acknowledge thee *C. D.* for my wedded wife
“ before these witnesses.”

And then the woman, taking the man by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words,—

“ I *C. D.* do take and acknowledge thee *A. B.* for my wedded hus-
“ band before these witnesses.”

Which said words and acknowledgment of marriage shall be fairly written or printed at the foot of or indorsed upon the certificate of the publication of banns or license, as the case may be, and shall be signed by the parties married, and attested by the justice and other witnesses present thereat, according to the form following:

“ Parish of the day of in the Year
“ WE, *L. M.* one of His Majesty's justices of the peace of the
“ county, division, or other place, and usually acting in the said
“ parish as such justice, do hereby attest that the before-mentioned

riage and certificate, (which shall be deposited and kept in the parish chest or registry,) and the fees usual and customary to be paid on marriages having been duly paid on granting the certificate of banns as herein-before mentioned, or being paid before the registration in the case of marriages by license, forthwith cause a true copy of such acknowledgment and certificate to be made and entered in the register book of marriages provided and kept by law, which entry shall specify the names of the magistrate; and such entry of such marriage shall be as effectual and valid for all purposes of proof of the said marriage, as the entry of any marriage duly had and solemnized, and registered, and according to the usages of the Church of England, and according to the provisions of the laws now in force relative thereto.

Provided always, and it is hereby enacted and declared, That the person entrusted with such acknowledgment and attestation, shall procure such entry or registration to be made of such marriage within the space of three days thereafter, but that the neglect thereof shall not be construed to affect or invalidate the said marriage; and that in case of default in procuring such entry within the space aforesaid, the man so entrusted shall be liable to forfeit and pay the sum of twenty pounds, one half whereof shall be paid to the informer, and the other half to the overseers of the poor of the parish in which the said marriage ought to have been registered, and shall be recoverable by conviction on information and summons before any justice of the peace, having jurisdiction within such parish, who shall have authority to mitigate the said penalty, nevertheless, to any sum not less than five pounds, and to levy the same, by warrant under his hand and seal, on the goods and chattels of the offender, who shall be at liberty to appeal against such conviction to the next General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, on entering into a recognizance, with a sufficient surety, to prosecute such appeal and pay such costs as shall be awarded by the justices at such General Quarter Sessions, who shall also have power to mitigate the said penalty: Provided always, that no such conviction shall take place, or such penalty be recoverable or inflicted, after the expiration of six calendar months from the commission of any such offence.

Provided nevertheless, and be it further enacted, That nothing hereinbefore contained shall operate or be construed so as to annul, defeat, or alter the provisions of any existing law relative to the previous publication of banns, or the obtaining of licenses, or any other qualifications, ceremonies, forms, or proceedings whatsoever, requisite for marriages, except so far as the same are expressly altered or dispensed with in this Act.

Provided always, and be it further enacted, That in case the parties propose to intermarry by license, and not by banns, it shall and may be lawful for them, on presentment of the same declaration and certificate, signed by the said parties, as is mentioned in the Schedule marked (A.) to this Act, to sue out a license in the usual manner, and under the restrictions provided by law in such cases, which license shall and may (with such alterations of the form thereof as shall be required for the purpose or the circumstances of the case) express that the same is for the purpose of authorizing the minister, parson, vicar, or curate, to

register, instead of to solemnize the said marriage, on production of the proper acknowledgment of the said marriage, and attestation subscribed thereto, and such license shall and may, within the time limited by law for such licenses remaining in force, be produced and delivered by the parties to the magistrate before whom such marriage is to be contracted, instead of the certificate of banns.

And be it further enacted, That all and every the penalties appointed and declared by law for or against the making of false entries, or the forging or counterfeiting of any entry in registers, or of any license for marriage, or for destroying any register, shall and are hereby declared to extend and be applicable to the falsely making, altering, forging, counterfeiting, or destroying any entry, license, or register of any marriage, or any declaration, certificate, acknowledgment, or attestation, to be made, signed, given, or granted, under the provisions thereof, or any signature thereto, or to acting or assisting therein, or knowingly uttering or publishing the same, or any copy thereof, as true.

Provided also, and be it further enacted, That this Act shall extend to England and Wales, and to the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed.

And be it further enacted, That two printed copies of this Act shall, as soon as conveniently may be after the passing thereof, be provided by His Majesty's printer, and transmitted to the officiating ministers of the several parishes and chapelries of England and Wales and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, respectively, one of which copies shall be deposited and kept, with the book containing the marriage register of such parish or chapelry, in the chest or box provided for the custody of the same.

Provided also, and be it further enacted, That nothing in this Act contained, shall be deemed or taken to alter or abrogate any law now in force relating to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

SCHEDULES to which this Act refers.

SCHEDULE (A.)

WE, the undersigned *A. B.* of _____ and *C. D.* of _____ do hereby declare, That we are members of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and who usually assemble for divine worship in a certain chapel or place situate at _____ in the parish of _____ and duly entered and registered according to law, and that we are desirous of taking the benefit of a certain Act passed in the eighth year of the reign of King George the Fourth, intitled "An Act for granting Relief to certain Persons dissenting from the Church of England, in respect of the Mode of celebrating Marriage."

As witness our hands,

A. B.
C. D.

WE do hereby certify and declare the truth of the above-written declaration, and that the same was signed by the said *A. B.* and *C. D.* in our presence.

As witness our hands,

E. F. of

G. H. of

I. K. of

{ Officiating Minister, or one of the Elders
of the above-mentioned Congregation.

{ Two of the Elders of the same Congregation.

SCHEDULE (B.)

I, [Rector, Vicar, Curate, or officiating Minister,]
of the parish or chapelry of _____ in the county of _____
do certify, That the banns of marriage have been duly published three
several times between _____ of _____ [or of this parish,]
and _____ of _____ [or of this parish,] the last of such
publications being made on the _____ day of _____ one
thousand eight hundred _____ and that no cause or just impediment
has been declared why such parties should not be married according
to law. Dated this _____ day of _____ one thousand
eight hundred _____

I. K.

C A S E

OF THE

EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

THE Members of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland profess the same Articles of Faith, make use of the same Liturgy, are subject to the same system of Church Government,—and in all respects agree with the Established Church of England.

Their Clergy derived their ordination and spiritual character from the same source as the Clergy of the Church of England. For a long course, their religion, recognised in law and ancient custom, was the Established religion, and their Clergy were maintained by the State.

At the Revolution in 1688, when the Presbyterian religion was established as the religion of the State, the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion were expelled from their cures, their legal provision was withdrawn, and from that time they have been maintained by voluntary contributions alone.

The number of those who compose the Episcopal communion in Scotland may amount to 60,000 and upwards—divided into 80 charges or 100 Congregations, many of which are situated in remote parts of the Highlands, at a great distance from each other, and consist of individuals possessed of very little property.

Their Church Establishment consists of Six Bishops and Seventy-four inferior Clergy. All of these perform congregational duties. The Bishops, besides, make triennial visitations of their dioceses, and many of the clergy have the charge of two, and several of three congregations.

For the sanctity of their lives, the purity of their morals, and their general respectability, the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal communion in Scotland may refer to all who know them, of whatever religious persuasion they may be; while their own flocks will afford the most willing and ample testimony to the purity of their doctrines, their individual piety, and the exemplary discharge of all their religious and moral duties.

This meritorious body of men derive their subsistence solely from voluntary contributions, with the addition of the income of a very small landed estate, and the interest of a small sum of money, the produce also of private benevolence.

The annual amount of these additions, increased by a few annual subscriptions, enable the trustees to allow to the Bishops £60 a-year each, to the most necessitous of the Clergy £15, to others £10, and to others £5 a-year each.

The inadequacy of this provision, combined with that derived from their respective congregations, may be imagined from the fact that Bishops, venerable for their age and character, and labouring under infirmities, have been compelled by necessity to travel in inclement weather to their distant dioceses, in discharge of their duties, on the outside of the public conveyances of the country, while the income of many of the inferior Clergy is less than the ordinary wages of a mechanic or day-labourer.*

* The following is an authentic STATEMENT of CLERICAL INCOME in the Highland Districts of ROSS and ARGYLE, and in the Diocese of MORAY:—

	£	s.	d.
Bishop Low of Ross and Argyle, from congregation £90, and from fund £60	150	0	0
Mr. Fyvie at Inverness, from congregation	130	0	0
Mr. Wm. Paterson at Ord, from two congregations £5, and from fund and private donations £31	36	0	0
Mr. Mackenzie of Dingwall, from two congregations £40, and from fund £15	55	0	0
Mr. Macmillan from two congregations £12, and from fund £15	27	0	0
Mr. Maclellan of Fort William, from congregation £20, and from fund £15	35	0	0
Mr. J. Paterson of Glengarry, from congregation £40, and from fund £5	45	0	0
Mr. P. McColl of Appin, from two congregations £45, and from fund £10	55	0	0
Bishop Jolly of Moray, from congregation £30, and from fund £60	90	0	0
Mr. Pressley his assistant, from congregation £30, and from fund £15	45	0	0
Mr. Buchan of Elgin, from congregation £30 and from fund £15	45	0	0
Mr. Murdoch from three congregations £15, and from fund £15	30	0	0
Mr. Walker of Huntley, from congregation £20, and from fund £15	35	0	0

In the district of Dunkeld, and country parts of Aberdeenshire, a similar list might be furnished.

Under these circumstances, relying on their well-known fidelity to the Constitution as established in Church and State, on their perfect agreement with the established Religion of England and Ireland, and on their useful services as an important part in effect of that communion, the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Communion in Scotland have petitioned Parliament to make some provision for their support.

They do not seek for affluence. All which they presume to expect is the means of decent subsistence. They are led to hope that the liberality of Parliament will afford them this provision, because they have been thought proper objects of assistance on three former occasions, as well as by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge,—the surest pledge of the propriety of some public provision for their body: and because, for a long period of time, the Protestant Dissenters of England and Ireland have annually received grants* from Parliament of a similar description, and to a considerable amount. And without departing from the purest spirit of charity, or incurring the charge of presumption, they may consider themselves as entitled to be put by the Parliament of the United Kingdom on a similar footing with the Dissenters from the Established Church of England and Ireland.

It would be indecorous in the extreme to offer more than an humble suggestion either as to the amount or the distribution of the liberality of Parliament. But it may be convenient to submit, that the annual sum of £10,000 sterling would afford them the means of obtaining the necessary comforts and conveniences of life, which they are at present unable to attain, and would enable them to perform their sacred duties with respectability, and of course with increased effect: And if the distribution of this sum were entrusted to the Bishops, to be allotted according to a scale which their acquaintance with the condition of the Clergy would enable them to form, it would be sure of effecting the object which Parliament intended to attain.

Such increase in their funds would enable them to appropriate to each of the Bishops an addition of £200 sterling a-year, or more, if circumstances and situation should seem to require it—to make an important addition to the income of the inferior Clergy, who most require it,—and, perhaps, to place the Theological Professorship in Edinburgh on a broader basis of usefulness.†

* See the annual Votes of the House of Commons, and particularly those of the 22d March, 1825, viz. “ To the Nonconforming Protestant and Seceding Ministers of Ireland, the sum of £13,984:13s. 3d. To ditto, in England, &c. the sum of £6,312:7s. 10d.”

† Numerous individuals from England, Ireland, and the Colonies, who are destined for orders in the Church, members even of the Universities, reside occasionally in Edinburgh for a considerable time, and some have been wholly educated there. Many of these, especially from the Colonies, and some even from the Universities, have received their elementary instruction in Divinity from the Episcopal Professor in Edinburgh. For a period of twenty years at least he has readily supplied such instruction as cases occurred to require it, and hitherto without fee or reward on the part of those who have sought such instruction.

STATE OF THE DIOCESES
IN
ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

CANTERBURY.

PREFERRED.

Hon. and Rev. R. Bagot, M.A. to the Deanery of Canterbury; Patron, the King.

Rev. F. Rouch, M.A. to a Minor Canonry in the Cathedral; Patron, the Dean and Chapter.

MARRIED.

Rev. J. W. Cunningham, Vicar of Harrow, to Miss Mary Harry Calvert.

DECEASED.

Rev. R. Mesham, M.A. Rector of Ripple, Kent, and Vicar of Bromham-cum-Oakley, Beds.

YORK.

PREFERRED.

Rev. G. Hough to the Incumbency of St. Peter's Church, Earlsheaton, in the parish of Dewsbury, Yorkshire; Patron, the Rev. J. Buckworth, M.A.

Rev. R. Grenside, B.A. to the Rectory of Crathorne; Patrons, G. Wentworth and R. Chaloner, Esqs.

Rev. J. Rudd, M.A. Vicar of Blyth, Nottinghamshire, to the Halloughton Prebend in the Collegiate Church of Southwell.

Rev. J. Lafont, M.A. to the Rectory of St. Anne's, Sutton Bonington, Notts; Patron, the King.

Rev. P. W. Worsley, to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church.

MARRIED.

Rev. W. Clarke, M.D. Rector of Guiseley, Yorkshire, to Miss Mary Willis.

Rev. W. Cuthbert, of Doncaster, to Mary Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Capt. F. R. Lapenstiere, R.N.

LONDON.

PREFERRED.

Rev. J. Greenwood, M.A. Head Master of the Grammar School, Christ's Hos-

pital, to the Rectory of Gainscolne, Essex; Patrons, the Governors.

Rev. J. Bluck, to the Rectory of Bower's Gifford, Essex; Patron, J. Curtis, Esq.

Rev. Mr. Fuller, to the Perpetual Curacy of St. Peter's, Pimlico.

Rev. Thomas Wise, to the Rectory of Barley, Hertfordshire; Patron, the Bishop of Ely.

Rev. R. Watkinson, B.D. to the Rectory of St. Lawrence Newland, Essex; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Rev. S. N. Bull, to the Vicarage of Harwich and Dovercourt-cum-Ramsey, both in Essex.

MARRIED.

Rev. Dr. Cresswell, Vicar of Enfield, to Miss Anne Thompson.

Rev. F. T. Atwood, M.A. Perpetual Curate of Hammersmith, to Miss Lucy Howard.

DECEASED.

Rev. Dr. Haultain, Vicar of East Ham, Essex, and Rector of Weybridge, Surrey.

Rev. G. Lawrance, Lecturer of All Hallows the Great and Less.

DURHAM.

PREFERRED.

Rev. Mr. Fielding, to the Curacy of St. Andrew Auckland, with the Chapelry of St. Ann's, Bishop Auckland, annexed.—Patron, the Lord Bishop.

Rev. Mr. Wyatt to the Perpetual Curacy of St. Giles, Durham; Patron, the Marquis of Londonderry.

Rev. J. Armstrong, to the Perpetual Curacy of Westhoe Chapel, South Shields; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Durham.

WINCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. T. Westcombe, M.A. to the Vicarage of Letcombe Regis, Berks; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

Rev. C. T. Longley, M.A. to the Rectory of Tytherley, Hampshire; Patron, C. B. Wall, Esq. M.P.

Rev. H. Lee, M. D. to a Fellowship of Winchester College.

DECEASED.

Rev. Christopher Thurgar, Perpetual Curate of Aldershott, Hants.

At Spring Gardens, near Ringwood, the Rev. H. Davies, Curate of that place.

Rev. W. Whinfield, B.D. Vicar of Romney and Dovercourt-cum-Harwich.

ST. ASAPH.

PREFERRED.

Rev. J. Luxmore, to the Vicarage of Berriew, Montgomeryshire; Patron, the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.

DECEASED.

Rev. E. Jones, Rector of Aberhafesp, and Vicar of Berriew, Montgomeryshire.

BATH AND WELLS.

PREFERRED.

Rev. W. Michell, to the Rectory of Barwick, Somerset; Patron, J. Newman, Esq.

Rev. C. H. Pulsford, M.A. to the Vicarage of Burnham, Somersetshire; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral.

Rev. J. W. Beadon, M.A. to be a Canon Residentiary in the Cathedral; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter.

Rev. A. Colvile, M.A. student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the vicarage of Midsummer Norton, Somersetshire.

BRISTOL.

DECEASED.

Rev. C. King, Rector of Witchampton, Dorset.

CARLISLE.

PREFERRED.

The Hon. and Rev. Dr. HUGH PERCY, late Lord Bishop of Rochester to be Lord Bishop of this Diocese.

DECEASED.

On Sunday, August 12, at Worthing, the Right Rev. SAMUEL GOODENOUGH, D.C.L. F.R.S. &c. &c. Lord Bishop of this Diocese, in the 85th year of his age.

CHESTER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. G. B. Blomfield, M.A. to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church.

Rev. J. Brocklebank, to the Rectory of Delamere, in the county of Chester; Patron, the King.

Rev. R. Remington, to be Chaplain and Vicar of the Collegiate Church of Manchester; Patrons, the Warden and Fellows.

MARRIED.

Rev. N. Gernon, Incumbent of St. Peter's, Manchester, to Miss Marianne Bellot.

DECEASED.

Rev. Thomas Ward, M.A. Vice-Dean and Prebendary in the Cathedral Church of Neston, and Rector of Handley.

Rev. John Allouby, Minister of Cartmel Fell, Lancashire.

Rev. T. Armistead, Vicar of Cockerham, Lancashire, and of Backford, Cheshire.

CHICHESTER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. G. H. Webber, M.A. to the Prebend of Somerley, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

MARRIED.

Rev. R. Allen, B.C.L. of Barcombe, Sussex, to Miss Mary Skinner.

DECEASED.

Rev. Mr. Walker, Rector of St. Pancras and Rumbold's Whyke, aged 83.

ST. DAVID'S.

PREFERRED.

Rev. Dr. Millingelamp, to the Archdeaconry of Carmarthen.

Rev. J. Jenkins, to the Vicarage of Norton, Radnorshire; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Rev. J. Griffith, to the Vicarage of Llangenor, Carmarthenshire; Patron, the Lord Bishop of St. David's.

Rev. T. Thoresby, A.B. to the Vicarage of St. Harmon, Radnorshire, and Llanwrthwl, Breconshire.

DECEASED.

Rev. E. Powell, Vicar of St. Harmon, Radnorshire, and Perpetual Curate of Llanwrthwl, Breconshire.

Rev. E. Thomas, Vicar of Llangrannog and Llandisilio-Goge, Cardiganshire.

ELY.

PREFERRED.

Rev. Martin Davy, D. D. to the Rectory of Cottenham; Patron, the King.

Rev. H. H. Barber, to the Rectory of Stretham; Patron, the King.

Rev. J. H. Sparke, to the Rectory of Leverington, Cambridgeshire; Patron, the Lord Bishop of Ely.

MARRIED.

Rev. J. G. Breay, Perpetual Curate of Haddenham, to Miss Phillis Harriet Peyton.

Rev. Professor Scholefield, A. M. to Miss Harriet Chase.

DECEASED.

Rev. J. Waterhouse, Rector of Little Stukeley, Hunts, and of Coton, Cambridgeshire.

EXETER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. C. G. R. Festing, M. A. to the Vicarage of St. Paul, Cornwall; Patron, Earl Eldon.

Very Rev. Dr. W. Landon, to the Vicarage of Branscombe, Devon; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Rev. G. May Coleridge, M. A. to the Vicarage of St. Mary's Church, Devon; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Rev. V. P. H. Somerset, B. A. to the Rectory of Honiton, Devon; Patron, H. Wrottesley, Esq.

MARRIED.

Rev. H. Strangways, Rector of Rewe, Devonshire, to Miss Hester Eleanora Buller.

Rev. J. Cuming, Master of the Grammar School, Chudleigh, to Miss Anna Maria Seppings.

DECEASED.

Rev. E. A. Kitson, Vicar of St. Mary's Church, Devon.

Rev. — Dommett, Rector of Hawkchurch, near Axminster.

GLoucester.

PREFERRED.

Rev. J. Simons, B. A. to the Vicarage of Dymock; Patron, A. Thompson.

Rev. F. D. Perkins, M. A. to the Vicarage of Down Hatherley, Gloucestershire; Patron, the King.

Rev. H. P. Willoughby, B. A. to the Rectory of Durthorpe; Patron, Earl Eldon.

Rev. Edward Willes, M. A. to the Rectory of Stratton, Gloucestershire; Patroness, Miss Master, of the Abbey, near Cirencester.

Rev. C. J. Hutton, B. A. late of Magdalen Hall, to be Episcopal Minister of the Chapel at Chalford, Gloucestershire; Patrons, the Trustees.

ORDAINED.

On Sunday, July 8th, in the Cathedral, by the Lord Bishop:

DEACONS.

Arthur Moore, B. A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Thomas Picton Jenkins, B. A. University College, Oxford.

John Jennings Smith, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

James Hardwick Dyer, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

John Calborne, B. A. Wadham College, Oxford.

Charles Wallington, B. A. Christ College, Cambridge.

HEREFORD.

PREFERRED.

Rev. E. Mellish, to the Deanery of Hereford.

Rev. W. Webster, B. C. L. to the Perpetual Curacy of Preen, Salop; Patron, W. Webster, Esq.

LICHFIELD.

DECEASED.

Rev. Dr. Lickorish, of Wolston, Warwick.

Rev. T. Chapman. He was for the last twelve years Lecturer of St. Philip's Church, Birmingham.

LLANDAFF.

PREFERRED.

Rev. W. A. Norton, to the Rectory of Skenfrith, Monmouthshire; Patron, W. Cecil, Esq.

Rev. Edward James, M. A. of Christ Church, Oxford, and Perpetual Curate of Mortlake, Surrey, to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church.

DECEASED.

Rev. C. Powell, Rector of Llanfoist, and Vicar of Llanvapley, Monmouthshire.

LINCOLN.

PREFERRED.

Rev. — Barber, to the Rectory of Little Stukeley, Hunts; Patroness, Lady Olivia Sparrow.

Rev. S. Cooper, M. A. to the Rectory of Wood Walton, Huntingdonshire; Patron, Admiral Sir R. H. Bickerton, Bart. K. C. B.

Rev. T. Turton, B. D. to the Prebend of Haydon with Walton, in the Cathedral.

Rev. C. Haycock, M. A. to the Rectory of Withcott and Perpetual Curacy of Owston, Leicestershire; Patron, the Rev. H. Palmer.

Rev. Alexander Dallas, to the Vicarage of Yardley, Herts; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral.

MARRIED.

Rev. — Browne, Vicar of Hinckley, Leicestershire, to Miss Lapworth.

DECEASED.

At Yardley Vicarage, Herts, the Rev. Wm. Parslow, Vicar of that parish.

Rev. Thos. Roe, M. A. Rector of Kirby-super-Baine, and Sotby, Lincolnshire.

Rev. Mr. Elsdale, Master of the Grammar School at Moulton, Lincolnshire.

Rev. Wm. Panchen, Rector of Wood-Walton, and Vicar of St. Mary's Parish, Huntingdon.

NORWICH.

PREFERRED.

Rev. T. P. Slapp, M. A. to the Rectory of Rekenhall Inferior with the Rectory of Rekenhall Superior annexed, Suffolk; Patron, R. Holt, Esq.

Rev. J. Fellowes, M. A. to the Rectory of Bramerton, Norfolk; Patron, R. Fellowes, Esq.

Rev. T. J. Abbott, M. A. to the Vicarage of Loddon, Cambridgeshire; Patron, the Lord Bishop of Ely.

Rev. H. Anson, M. A. to the Rectory of Lynge-cum-Whitwell, Norfolk; Patron, E. Lombe, Esq. of Great Melton.

Rev. Wm. Jex Blake, B. A. to the Rectory of Hautbois Magna, Norfolk; Patron, Sir J. W. Lubbock, Bart.

Rev. T. S. Buckel, M. A. to the Rectory of Beighton, Norfolk; Patron, R. Fellowes, Esq.

Rev. E. J. Bell, to the Vicarage of Wickham Market, Suffolk; Patron, the King.

Rev. J. Shirley, M. A. of Trinity College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Antingham St. Mary, Norfolk; Patron, Lord Suffolk.

MARRIED.

Rev. E. D. Butts, of Glemsford, Suffolk, to Miss Mary Hill.

Rev. J. Edwards, B. A. Perpetual Curate of Wattisham and Ercet, Suffolk, to Miss Elizabeth Mary Spurrier.

DECEASED.

Rev. John Denison, Rector of Hautbois, and Vicar of Loddon.

Rev. W. Baynes, Rector of the parishes of Rekenhall Superior and Inferior, Somerset.

OXFORD.

PREFERRED.

Rev. H. T. Jones, B. D. to the Vicarage of Charlbury; Patrons, the President and Scholars of St. John's College.

Rev. Thos. Symonds, to the Vicarage of Stanton Harcourt, Oxfordshire; Patron, the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

MARRIED.

Rev. G. Dandridge, of Rousham, Oxfordshire, to Miss Anna Maria Probyn.

PETERBOROUGH.

PREFERRED.

Hon. and Rev. H. Watson, M. A. to the Rectory of Kettering, Northamptonshire; Patron, the King.

Rev. J. W. Harding, M. A. to the Vicarage of Sulgrave, Northamptonshire; Patron, W. Harding, Esq.

Rev. B. G. Bridges, to the Rectory of Orlingbury, Northamptonshire; Patron, B. W. Bridges, Esq.

ROCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. W. King, M. A. to the Archdeaconry of Rochester.

Hon. and Rev. M. J. Stapleton, to the Vicarage of Tudley-cum-Capel, and the Rectory of Mereworth; Patron, Thomas Lord Le Despencer.

Rev. R. Cockburn, to the Rectory of Barming, Kent; Patron, the King.

Rev. F. W. Bayley, to a Prebendary in the Cathedral.

DECEASED.

Rev. J. Pieters, M. A. Vicar of Downe.

SALISBURY.

PREFERRED.

Rev. Liscombe Clarke, M. A. to the Archdeaconry of Sarum, and Prebend of Minor Pars Altaris, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

Rev. D. F. Markham, M. A. to a Prebend in St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Rev. J. Pike, to the Vicarage of Upavon, Wilts; Patron, the King.

Rev. H. C. Cherry, M.A. to the Rectory of Burghfield, Berks.

MARRIED.

Rev. W. E. Hony, Rector of Baverstock, to Miss Margaret Earle.

DECEASED.

On Tuesday, the 10th of July, at the advanced age of 83, the Venerable Charles Daubeny, D.C.L. formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford, Archdeacon and one of the Prebendaries of Salisbury, Fellow of Winchester College, and 53 years Vicar of North Bradley. He founded an elegant Chapel of Ease at Road, two Almshouses at Bradley, with three official manses, and became a parochial benefactor to the amount of ten thousand pounds, superadded to augmentation of the Incumbency, by surrender of his personal interest in the rectorial tithe, with annual donation of one hundred pounds to the poor. Having completed his Archdeaconal Visitation the preceding week, he delivered a pastoral address to his congregation at Road, but forty-eight hours before his demise. The news of his death was as unexpected, as the event itself proved awfully sudden; and the shock caused by the intelligence was the more sensibly felt, as the provincial papers but two days previous spoke of the venerable Archdeacon as being in the enjoyment of excellent health, and actively engaged in the arduous duties of his Visitation.

At Burghfield, near Reading, the Rev. M. Robinson, Rector of that parish.

WORCESTER.

PREFERRED.

Rev. Wm. Marshall, M.A. to the Vicarage of All Saints', with St. Lawrence annexed, in the borough of Evesham; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

ORDAINED.

July 25th, at Saint Nicholas' Church, Worcester, by the Lord Bishop:

DEACONS.

Richard Rawlins, B.A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

John Gwyther, B.A.

Thomas Hill, B.A.

PRIESTS.

Matthew Getley, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Richard Morris, B.A.
Morgan Walter Morgan, literate.

CHAPLAINS.

Rev. T. Stacey, M.A. Rector of Gellygar, to be Chaplain to the Earl of Dunraven.

Rev. P. Still, B.A. to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Duke of Leeds.

Rev. G. Mingay, M.A. Rector of Kennet, Cambridgeshire, to be Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Rutland.

Rev. W. H. Roberts, M.A. to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Duke of Clarence.

Rev. W. Ward, D.D. to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to Viscount Goderich.
Rev. C. H. Lethbridge, to be Chaplain of H. M. S. Hyperion.

Rev. E. F. Roberts, to be Chaplain of H. M. S. Gloucester,

Rev. J. K. Goldney, to be Chaplain of H. M. S. Victory.

Rev. T. Ferris, to be Chaplain of H. M. S. Britannia.

Rev. T. Quarles, to be Chaplain of H. M. S. Briton.

Rev. T. Lloyd, to be Chaplain of Hertford Gaol.

Rev. J. Blanchard, to be Domestic Chaplain to Earl Ferrers.

Rev. C. Paroissien, to be Chaplain to St. Thomas's Hospital; Patrons, the Governors.

SCHOOLS.

Rev. H. Brown, M.A. to the Mastership of the Kepier Grammar School at Houghton-le-Spring, in the County of Durham.

Rev. D. Coleridge, B.A. to the Free and Endowed Grammar School of Helstone, Cornwall.

Rev. J. Bligh, M.A. to the Mastership of the Free Grammar School at Kimbolton; Patrons, the Trustees.

SCOTCH CHURCH.

Rev. J. Morison, to the Scotch Church at Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

Rev. D. Welsh, to the Parish of St. David's, Glasgow.

Rev. W. Henderson, to St. Paul's Chapel, Edinburgh.

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE UNIVERSITIES.

OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED, FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

June 23.

Lord Viscount Morpeth, Christ College.
Rev. Robert Alderson, Exeter College.
Rev. George Colebrooke Jordan, Pembroke College.

Rev. Carr John Glyn, Christ Church.
Rev. Gregory Birch Boraston, Fellow of Queen's College.

Rev. Edmund Ludlow, St. Edmund Hall.

Rev. W. J. Butler, Demy of Magdalen College.

Rev. T. H. Dyke, Student of Christ Church.

Rev. Daniel James Eyre, Oriel College.

Rev. J. Russell Phillott, Demy of Magdalen College.

Rev. E. J. Wingfield, Student of Christ Church.

Rev. T. S. L. Vogau, St. Edmund Hall.

Rev. James Thomas, Pembroke College.

Rev. John Marshall, Worcester College.
Rich. Beauvoir Berens, Christ Church.

E. Goodenough Bayley, Fellow of Pembroke College.

John West Henry, Pembroke College.

Samuel Hartopp Knapp, Merton College.

Thomas Pryce Lloyd, Christ Church.

July 7.

Rev. Edward Willes, Brasenose College.

Rev. George Robert Michael Ward, Fellow of Trinity College.

Rev. Zachary James Edwards, Fellow of Wadham College.

Rev. William Harding, Fellow of Wadham College.

Rev. Thomas Charles Webber, Christ Church.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

July 7.

John Fielding Willis, Oriel College.

James White, Pembroke College.

Philip Wrington, Oriel College.

John Francis Cole, Worcester College.

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

June 27.

(Commemoration,) the Honorary Degree of D. C. L. was conferred on Thomas G. B. Estcourt, Esq. of Corpus, M.P. for the University; Henry Hobhouse, Esq. M.A. of Brasenose College, one of his Majesty's Under Secretaries of State for the Home Department; Edward J. Foot, Esq. of Highfield, Hants, Vice-Admiral of the Red; Sheffield Grace, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn; and Christopher Wren, Esq. of Wroxall Priory, Warwickshire.

At the same time, the Rev. James William Geldart, D. C. L. of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and Regius Professor of Civil Law in that University, was admitted *ad eundem*; after which the Honorary Degree of M.A. was conferred on Stephen Jarratt, Esq. Gentleman Commoner of Magdalen College.

June 30.

The following gentlemen were admitted actual Fellows of Wadham College:—John Foley, of kin to the Founder; Rev. Z. J. Edwards. At the same time the following elections took place in the same Society:—*Probationary Fellows*—F. Forster, of kin to the Founder; Rev. William Harding.—*Scholars*—Edw. Walwyn

Foley, of kin to the Founder; J. B. Dyne, of the county of Somerset; G. E. Gepp and A. C. Tarbutt, of the county of Essex.

Same day, William Falconer, B.A. of Oriel College; Rev. Hubert Kestell Cornish, B.A. of Corpus Christi College; George Dawson, B.A. of Exeter College; William Sewell, B.A. of Merton College; and James Fisher, Commoner of Brasenose College, were elected Fellows of Exeter College.

July 7.

The nomination of the Rev. John Henry Newman, M.A. Fellow of Oriel College, as a Public Examiner in *Literis Humanioribus*, was unanimously approved.

July 9.

Mr. Frederick Wickham was admitted Scholar of New College.

July 12.

Mr. Charles Palaret, B.A. of Queen's College, was elected a Fellow of that Society on Mr. Michel's Foundation.

July 19.

William Abbott, John Hodgson, John Barrow, and John Richardson, were elected Scholars on the Old Foundation of Queen's College.

Lancelot Arthur Sharpe, Thomas French Laurence, and George Adams, were admitted Actual Fellows; and James Gilman, Arthur Philip Dunlap, and Robert William Browne, were elected Scholars of St. John's College.

George Malim, Commoner of Lincoln College, was elected one of Lord Crew's Exhibitioners of that Society.

July 26.

The Rev. James Robert Pears, M.A. and Mr. J. G. Hutchinson Bourne, B.A. were admitted Actual Fellows; and the Rev. Henry Jenkins, M.A. Mr. R. Durnford, M.A. and Mr. Robert Price Morrell, B.A. of Balliol College, Probationary Fellows of Magdalen College.—The same day, William Walter Tireman, of Wadham College, and Mr. John Posthumous Wilson, of Lincoln College, were admitted Demies of the above-mentioned Society.

The following Scholars, on the foundation of Winchester College, are placed on the rolls of New College, for admission as vacancies occur:—Adams, Hughes, Sewell, Heathcote, Cox, Fooks, Fortescue, Wither, Waddington, Everett, Wells, Hill, Jackson, Trollope, Spooner, Wetherell, Johnson, Hill, Hall, Austen.

Aug. 6.

At the Visitation of Abingdon Grammar School, Mr. James Robertson, son of Dr. Robertson, of Nettlebed, was elected a Scholar of Pembroke College on Tesdale Foundation.

Aug. 7.

Mr. Simon Thomas Adams was admitted to a Founder's-kin Fellowship of New College, vacant by the election of the Rev. Harry Lee, B.D. to a Fellowship of Winchelsea College.

The Governors of Harrow School have instituted Scholarships of 50 guineas value during four years' residence at this University or Cambridge. The two successful candidates this year are Nathaniel Oxnam, son of the Prebendary of Exeter, and F. L. Popham, son of Lieutenant-General Popham, Littlecot, Wilts.

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

July 3.

John Lamb, Master of Corpus Christi College.

Joseph Lawson Sisson, Clare Hall.

DOCTORS IN MEDICINE.

Christopher J. R. Allatt, Trinity College.

William Clark, Trinity College, Professor of Anatomy.

Edmund Lambert, Pembroke College.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

June 30.

John Evans, Fellow of Clare Hall.

HONORARY MASTER OF ARTS.

July 1.

His Grace the Duke of Buccleugh and
Queensbury, St. John's College.

LICENTIATE IN PHYSIC.

June 30.

John Burdett Steward, Pembroke College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

July 3.

Matthew Anderson, St. John's College.
Henry Arlett, Pembroke College.
Charles Arnold, Caius College.
George Atkinson, Queen's College.
Richardson J. Atkinson, Queen's Col-
lege.
Thomas Atkinson, Pembroke College.
Charles Austin, Jesus College.
John Ayre, Caius College.
Edward B. Bagshawe, Magdalen Col-
lege.
Edward Baines, Christ College.
John Baldwin, Christ College.
William Foster Barham, Trinity Col-
lege.
Richard Battersby, St. John's College.
Charles H. B. Bazely, Clare Hall.
G. D. B. Beaumont, Trinity College.
Charles R. Beauclerk, Caius College.
Herbert N. Beaver, Catharine Hall.
John H. Bell, St. John's College.
Edw. Rich. Benyon, St. John's Col-
lege.
Wm. Baker Bere, Emmanuel College.
Jos. Wm. Berry, St. Peter's College.
Thomas Bingham, St. John's College.
William Birch, Catharine Hall.
Charles Smith Bird, Trinity College.
George Wm. Birkett, St. John's Col-
lege.
George Blake, Emmanuel College.
George B. Blomfield, Christ College.
James Bowstead, Corpus Christi Col-
lege.
Bidlake Bray, Emmanuel College.
John Brounlow, St. John's College.
T. Murray Browne, Trinity College.
John Buckle, Trinity College.
Robert B. Buckle, Sidney Sussex Col.
Charles Joseph Camidge, Catharine
Hall.
George G. Carrighan, St. John's Col-
lege.
John Carter, St. John's College.
Aug. P. Clayton, Caius College.
John Francis Cobb, St. Peter's College.
John T. P. Coffin, Caius College.

Thomas Cooper Colls, Christ College.
William A. Collins, Christ College.
Isaac Preston Cory, Caius College.
John Cowling, St. John's College.
William Crawley, Magdalen College.
John Crosland, Magdalen College.
Richard Daniel, Clare Hall.
John Dearden, St. Peter's College.
Charles Jones Denton, Christ College.
John Dodsworth, Queen's College.
Joseph Dovell, St. John's College.
Charles D. M. Drake, St. John's Col-
lege.
Richard Gelson Duck, St. John's Col-
lege.
Charles Dudley, Clare Hall.
Robert Dunderdale, St. John's College.
Richard Dunning, Queen's College.
David Evans, St. Peter's College.
William B. Evans, Trinity College.
Henry Fearon, Emmanuel College.
Edmund Fitz-Moore, Caius College.
William Ford, Magdalen College.
William Foster, Trinity College.
Edward Francis, St. John's College.
T. Ward Franklin, St. John's College.
Robert Frost, Catharine Hall.
William Fry, Queen's College.
Thomas William Gage, Magdalen Col-
lege.
Sydney Gedge, Catharine Hall.
Robert Wade Geery, Emmanuel Col-
lege.
Nicholas William Gibson, Trinity Col-
lege.
John H. Gossip, Pembroke College.
Henry A. Greaves, Corpus Christi Col-
lege.
Daniel Green, Catharine Hall.
Edward Grubb, Trinity College.
Edwin Guest, Caius College.
John H. Gurney, Trinity College.
Thomas G. Hall, Magdalen College.
Edward P. Hannam, St. John's College.
Jacob Hargrave, St. John's College.
G. Selby Hell, St. Peter's College.
Armine Herring, Corpus Christi Col-
lege.
Edmund Hill, Christ College.
Walter Henry Hill, Emmanuel College.
John Hills, St. John's College.
John Hogg, St. Peter's College.
Frederick P. Hoole, Trinity College.
William N. Hooper, Corpus Christi
College.
William Hyde, St. John's College.
John Image, Caius College.
James A. Jeremie, Trinity College.
Cornelius Jesson, St. John's College.
Jenkins Jones, St. John's College.

Thomas H. Jones, St. Peter's College.
 Matthew Kinsey, Trinity College.
 William Latten, St. John's College.
 Charles Lawson, St. John's College.
 Edward C. Lawton, Clare Hall.
 William Henry Layton, Queen's College.
 Charles Lendon, Trinity College.
 Mauritius Lloyd, Emmanuel College.
 John Lubbock, Caius College.
 John Lunan, Caius College.
 R. W. S. Lutwidge, St. John's College.
 John Richard Major, Trinity College.
 Frederick Malkin, Trinity College.
 Francis Martin, Trinity College.
 John G. Maxwell, Caius College.
 John Dove Miller, St. John's College.
 G. S. M. Montgomerie, Christ College.
 Robert Montgomery, St. Peter's College.
 William T. Napleton, Sidney Sussex College.
 Frederick North, St. John's College.
 John Docwra Parry, St. Peter's College.
 Samuel Paynter, Trinity College.
 Frederick B. Pearson, Trinity College.
 Henry Peckett, Trinity College.
 Francis Pickford, Queen's College.
 John Charles Pigott, Trinity College.
 Henry Pixel, Clare Hall.
 William Henry Place, Trinity College.
 Thomas Remington, Trinity College.
 Joseph Rigg, Corpus Christi College.
 Robert Rising, Pembroke College.
 Isaac B. Robinson, Trinity College.
 Nicholas Robinson, Trinity College.
 Richard Swan Robson, Catharine Hall.
 John Rodnel, Trinity College.
 Richard P. Ruddock, St. John's College.
 William Travis Sandys, Pembroke College.
 William Hughes Scott, St. John's College.
 Thomas Scratton, Christ College.
 William Grudott Sealy, St. John's College.
 Simon Sendale, Caius College.
 Edmund John Senkler, Caius College.
 Henry Severne, Christ College.
 Thomas Sewell, Sidney Sussex College.
 John Shillibeer, Jesus College.
 Jacob Sydney, Catharine Hall.
 Charles A. J. Smith, St. John's College.
 Henry Joseph Smith, Trinity College.
 John Abel Smith, Christ College.
 William Start, Trinity College.
 Henry Stebbing, St. John's College.
 James Sumner, Trinity College.
 Robert W. Sutton, Clare Hall.

Richard Symes, Jesus College.
 Thomas Taylor, Catharine Hall.
 John Teeson, Clare Hall.
 Sanderson Tennant, Trinity College.
 Wm. James Thornton, Trinity College.
 John Truman, Catharine Hall.
 Joseph Turner, Corpus Christi College.
 William H. Turner, Pembroke College.
 Edward J. W. Valpy, Emmanuel College.
 Garrod Wade, Jesus College.
 William Serocold Wade, St. John's College.
 George Wailes, Catharine Hall.
 Henry Wardell, Trinity College.
 Randle J. Waters, Christ College.
 Gifford Wells, Sidney Sussex College.
 William N. Welsby, St. John's College.
 Thomas B. Whitehurst, St. Peter's College.
 Francis White, Trinity College.
 C. Walter Whiter, Clare Hall.
 Jocelyn Willey, Trinity College.
 Thomas Williams, St. John's College.
 Robert D. Wilmot, St. John's College.
 Edward Wilson, Catharine Hall.
 Richard Wilson, St. John's College.
 Charles Peter Wilton, St. John's College.
 Thomas H. Winbolt, Pembroke College.
 William B. Winning, Trinity College.
 Samuel S. Wood, Corpus Christi College.
 William Page Wood, Trinity College.
 Charles C. Worsley, Pembroke Col.
 John C. Worsley, Pembroke College.
 Charles Isaac Yorke, Trinity College.
 Benjamin Young, St. John's College.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

June 30.

Charles Birch, Trinity Hall.
 Rev. Geo. Holbrook, Trinity Hall.

July 1.

Rev. John Fred. Dawson, Trinity College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

June 30.

James Flamank, Fellow of King's College.

July 1.

George Cheere, Queen's College.
 John Wallace King, Trinity College.

Sept. 2.

Mr. Capell Lofft, of King's College, was admitted Fellow of that Society.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

COMBINATION PAPER, 1827.

Prior Comb.

- Aug. 5. Coll. Trin.
- 12. Coll. Joh.
- 19. Mr. Goodrich, Chr.
- 26. Mr. Harris, Cath.
- Sept. 2. Mr. Heath, Clar.
- 9. Mr. Cobb, Cai.
- 16. Coll. Regal.
- 23. Coll. Trin.
- 30. Coll. Joh.
- Oct. 7. Mr. Hadwen, Chr.
- 14. Mr. Gleadall, Cath.
- 21. Mr. Gooch, C. C.
- 28. *Commem. Benefact.*
- Nov. 4. Mr. Bolton, Cai.
- 11. Coll. Regal.
- 18. Coll. Trin.
- 25. Coll. Joh.
- Dec. 2. Mr. Jefferson, Pet.
- 9. Mr. Currie, Pemb.
- 16. Mr. Williamson, Sid.
- 23. Mr. Kelly, Cai.
- 30. Coll. Regal.

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Resp. in Theolog.</i> | <i>Oppon.</i> |
| Mr. R. Smith, Trin. | { Mr. D'Arblay, Chr. |
| | { Mr. Hutchins, Pemb. |
| | { Mr. Macdowall, C.C. |
| Mr. Petteward, Trin. | { Mr. Burroughes, Em. |
| | { Coll. Regal. |
| | { Coll. Trin. |
| | { Coll. Joh. |
| Mr. Pemberton, Pet. | { Mr. Hallowell, Chr. |
| | { Mr. Venn, Regin. |

Poster. Comb.

- Aug. 5. Mr. Stedman, Trin.
- 12. Mr. Harness, Chr.
- 19. Mr. Procter, Cath.
- 24. Mr. Symonds, Joh.
- 26. Mr. Manley, Regal.
- Sept. 2. Mr. T. Thorpe, Emm.
- 9. Mr. Seymour, Emm.
- 16. Mr. A. M. Campbell, Joh.

- 21. Mr. Ellis, sen. Trin.
- 23. Mr. Tacey, Regin.
- 29. Mr. C. D. Brereton, Regiu.
- Mr. Lyall, Trin.
- 30. Mr. H. Hatch, Regal.
- Oct. 7. Mr. Pote, Regal.
- 14. Mr. Blake, Regal.
- 18. *Fest. S. Luc.* Mr. Darby, Cai.
- 21. Mr. Wodsworth, Pemb.
- 23. Mr. Mirehouse, Clar.
- Nov. 1. Mr. Lodington, Clar.
- Mr. Paske, Clar.
- 4. Mr. King, sen. Regin.
- 11. Mr. Graham, Regin.
- 13. Mr. Carr, Regin.
- 25. Mr. Atkinson, Regin.
- 30. Mr. Gilly, Cath.
- Dec. 2. Mr. Abdy, Jes.
- 9. Mr. Stevens, Jes.
- 16. Mr. Sheepshanks, Jes.
- 21. Mr. Case, Jes.
- 23. Mr. Croft, Chr.
- 25. Mr. Millett, Chr.
- 26. Mr. Clarke, Chr.
- 27. Mr. Mirehouse, Chr.
- 28. Mr. Wilkinson, Joh.
- 30. Mr. Bullen, Joh.

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Resp. in Jur. Civ.</i> | <i>Oppon.</i> |
| Mr. Clarkson, Jes. | { Mr. Hustler, Jes. |
| | { Mr. Seymour, Pemb. |

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Resp. in Medic.</i> | <i>Oppon.</i> |
| Mr. Shaw, Cai. | { Mr. Bond, C. C. |
| | { Mr. Morton, Trin. |

The following persons have been elected Preachers each for the month to which his name is affixed :—

- October . . Mr. Graham, Christ's.
- November . Mr. Walter, St. John's.
- December . Professor Lec, Queen's.
- January . . Mr. H. V. Elliott, Trinity.
- February . Mr. Lonsdale, King's.
- March . . . Mr. Blunt, St. John's.
- April . . . Mr. Rose, Trinity.
- May . . . Mr. Le Bas, Trinity.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

FROM THE

EARLIEST PERIODS TO THE PRESENT TIME;

in which it is intended to consider

MEN AND EVENTS

ON

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES.

BY A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS work has been undertaken from the wish, that our National History might be taught without connecting it with a constant call to worldly-mindedness.

The Author does not propose to write for the professed Political Scholar; but offers the result of his studies for the benefit of those who are contented to aim at less ambitious attainments.

He will, therefore, endeavour to make whatever he has occasion to speak of intelligible to persons of limited information; and to keep down the size of his work to about the scale of Goldsmith's history. At the same time, as the sanguinary details of war are, in his view, the least important of the subjects on which he has to treat, the brevity of his notices of them will leave a larger space for recording and examining the progress and decline of Religion, the formation of our excellent Constitution, the state of Public Morals and Literature, and the advance and diffusion of the Useful Arts.

* * The Author having, in the following Preface, fully explained his Plan, and the motives which induced him to undertake the Work, the Publishers beg leave to state that it will be printed in duodecimo on a good Paper, and that it will appear monthly in Numbers at sixpence. Each Number will contain forty-eight pages of Letter-press. It is presumed that the Work will be comprised in forty-eight Numbers, forming four Volumes.

The Publication will commence on the first of October, and will be sold by C. and J. RIVINGTON, *St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall*; and by all other Booksellers in Town and Country.

PREFACE.

EVERY man, capable of reflecting on what is going on around him, must have some desire to know how the state of things, which he sees, has grown up; or, in other words, what is the history of the past.

The Bible meets this natural curiosity with the most important information to which his thoughts can be directed; telling him, that man was created innocent, but seduced into disobedience.—That from this one source has proceeded all the vice, and all the misery under which *the whole creation groaned and travailed in pain together* *, until the coming of Christ to redeem from condemnation such as, seeking the guidance of the Holy Ghost, *walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit; and being led by the Spirit of God, receive the inestimable and elevated title of children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, with whom they shall be glorified* †.

Compared with the value of this information, every other subject of enquiry becomes vain and insignificant. Indeed, one who should hear it for the first time, and who knew nothing of the reception this knowledge generally meets with, would assuredly expect, that whoever heard these things, and believed them, would be so absorbed and elevated by the contemplation of them, that he could not descend again to any other subject of thought, unless it was to help him, in some way or other, to do what the leading of the Spirit might require of him; or to assist some fellow-creature in finding that light, whose salutary rays were cheering and enlivening his own path. And these considerations would carry him on from this great view of the general history of man, to desire such knowledge of the particular history of the country in which he dwells, as may prevent his being ignorant of any peculiar debt of gratitude for special instances of mercy shewn towards it, and enjoyed immediately, or in their consequences, by himself. He would be farther induced to make such enquiries from perceiving, that he had duties, as a member of the society in which it had pleased God to place him; which duties he could not properly fulfil, without knowing to what laws that society would justly require his submission;—what rights he was bound to assist that society, by all lawful means, in preserving;—and, more particularly, whether the Church established in his country for the service and honour of God, was well fitted for the promotion of those great ends;—in what respect it might need his prayers, or require his help towards its improvement;—how far, and in what way, he could promote its useful influence.

* Rom. viii. 22.

† Ibid. v. 4. 14. 16, 17.

The compilers of our Liturgy, when they instruct us to pray, "O Lord arise, help us and deliver us," have bidden us at the same time to say, "O Lord we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them." From this combination they seem to have expected, or at least they must be supposed to have wished to teach, that English fathers should tell their children what great things God hath ever continued to do for his Church, and what peculiar blessings he hath showered on this our country.

If this duty be neglected, people may yet be found willing to obey the occasional calls of their Sovereign, by observing national fasts and thanksgivings; because they are not disposed to deny that obedience is due to the King, and honour to God. But is it likely, or possible, that when thus summoned, they should plead before God with the same earnestness and fervour, as if they had in mind how former events had been ordered by Him for the benefit of their fathers; and that He might therefore, without presumption, be expected to let the prayers of the faithful again draw forth some special interference to complete those works of mercy?

But though individuals, like the Samaritan leper, have turned from walking with the unthankful crowd, to give glory to God, with heartfelt gratitude, for the wonderful blessings heaped upon this Country, writers of English history have not taught their generation to consider what was done in the old time before them, as the effect of God's mercy. Some historians have been unhappily notorious for their hostility to Religion; or for an ungrateful and perverse blindness to the merits of the form of government under which events have been made to place us. Nearly all have only differed from heathen historians by occasional expressions of respect for Christianity. Whilst they have confessed God with their lips, they have spoken of events, as if He had no share and no object in their arrangement; as if He took no part in the disposal of the world, unless when He is seen interrupting the order of nature by miraculous interference.

It can scarcely be necessary to observe how different this is from the language of Him who knew the Father, and spake of Him as always producing, by the exertion of His will, what we term the daily course of nature; saying, "He maketh the sun to rise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

If the worldly historian be a lover of the moral virtues, he will too certainly be found to make the general tenor of his observations lead to the subverting of the proper order of the two great commandments. Patriotism and benevolence towards man always stand, with him, before devotion to God and zeal for His service. But, in general, the historian does not even pretend to such an inflexible affection, even for morality, as to preclude him from preferring able policy and successful ambition, particularly if the latter be exercised at the expense of foreign nations, before scrupulous integrity. As for humble self-denial, or the piety, which afraid of giving power to worldly temptations, prays for permission

to devote more tranquil and abundant leisure to preparation for appearing before God, they are never spoken of in history, but with pity or contempt. The ordinary writer of history *calls the proud happy; yea, they that work wickedness*, if their purposes were carried on boldly and skilfully, *are set up on high for admiration**. The effect of such unscriptural views of men's conduct, and of events, is, too frequently, to make the student rise from a course of historical reading, impressed with the notion that Religion is merely theoretical; what wise men will not, and conscience need not upbraid him for neglecting in practice, provided his inattention to its dictates be influenced by what he thinks good policy, and does not extend to what he calls gross offences.

That acute, and certainly not over fastidious observer of human life, Dr. Paley, has made remarks of the same kind, on the evident tendency of such opinions as are read in the ordinary course of historical studies, and heard in ordinary worldly society, to communicate a corrupting and indelible taint to the sentiments of youth.

“The general course of education,” he observes, “is much against religious seriousness, even without those who conduct education foreseeing or intending any such effect. Many of us are brought up with this world set before us, and nothing else. Whatever promotes this world's prosperity is praised; whatever hurts and obstructs and prejudices this world's prosperity is blamed; and there all praise and censure end.

“We see mankind about us in motion and action, but all these motions and actions directed to worldly objects. We hear their conversation, but it is all the same way.

“And this is what we see and hear from the first. The views which are continually placed before our eyes regard this life alone, and its interests. Can it then be wondered at, that an early worldly-mindedness is bred in our hearts, so strong as to shut out heavenly-mindedness entirely? In the contest which is always carrying on between this world and the next, it is no difficult thing to see what advantages this world has. One of the greatest of these advantages is, that it pre-occupies the mind; it gets the first hold and the first possession. Childhood and youth, left to themselves, are necessarily guided by the senses; and the senses are all on the side of this world. Meditation brings us to look towards a future life; but then meditation comes afterwards. It only comes when the mind is already filled, and engaged, and occupied, nay, often crowded and surcharged with worldly ideas. It is not only therefore fair and right, but it is absolutely necessary to give to Religion all the advantages we can give it by dint of education; for all that can be done is too little to set Religion upon an equality with its rival; which rival is the world. A creature, which is to pass a small portion of its existence in one state, and that state preparatory to another, ought, no doubt, to have its attention constantly fixed upon its ulterior and permanent destination †.”

* Malachi iii. 15.

† Paley's Sermons, Sermon I. pp. 7, 8. Ed. 4.

This statement is as strikingly just as it is dispassionate. It is to be feared that these impediments to a thorough devotedness to God will never cease to occur and to operate, till the prayer be fully heard and granted, which asks that God's *kingdom* may come and be established; and that *His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven*. Yet the weakest endeavours may, by God's blessing, destroy much of the pernicious influence of evils which man cannot remove. Under this conviction, and from a most anxious wish to do something towards rescuing unsuspecting youth from the snares laid in their way by such as *call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness*, the writer has been induced to resolve on offering his countrymen a History of England, in which all praise and censure will not be found to be distributed solely with reference to the tendency of actions to promote or obstruct worldly prosperity.

Bishop Butler has observed, that "Scripture gives us an account of the world, in this one single view, as God's world; by which it appears essentially distinguished from all other books, except such as are copied from it*." Such an imitation of the tone of the sacred penmen, the author trusts he cannot be wrong in proposing to himself, as the rule whereby to regulate his opinions of events and of public characters. He will endeavour, in forming his estimate of either, to think how they, who constantly regarded the world as God's world, would have spoken of what it becomes his duty to notice.

But though the writer may perceive what ought to be his object, and his manner of speaking, the defects of his predecessors are an awful warning to him to take heed himself, that the effect of the subjects which must engage his attention, be not to *overcharge his heart* likewise *with the cares of this life*. It may now seem to him quite as much a proof of a little as of a corrupt mind to be incapable of perceiving, that all which can be gained or lost of earthly treasures, of power or fame, is lighter than dust in the balance, when compared with the hopes of that glory in which they, who serve God faithfully, *shall reign for ever and ever when this earth and heaven are fled away*. But yet he reads, and believes, that instead of its being an easy thing to keep this infinite disproportion between the objects of a day and of eternity effectually present to the mind, *the Spirit of wisdom must be given, and the eyes of the understanding must be enlightened*, that man may be made capable of knowing *what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance*. For these blessings, therefore, he will feel it his urgent duty to seek; lest, whilst labouring to *please his neighbour for his good to edification*, his heart should become so estranged by worldly objects from communion with its Maker, as to wish to *hide itself from the presence of the Lord God*, when he shall say, *Where art thou?*

On the other hand, in the performance of his task, though it be undeniably the duty of every Christian writer, as it was that of the sacred penmen, to speak of facts with a fixed impression of the power and of

* Butler's Analogy, Part II. chap. vii.

the influence exercised by the King of kings, and Lord of lords, as from His throne beholding all the dwellers upon earth, the uninspired historian, instead of the certainty with which the purposes and the judgments of God are declared in Holy Writ, can only offer humble, and frequently erroneous conjectures as to the lesson which it was intended mankind should receive from God's suffering that to happen which we see, in any case, He has permitted.

Perhaps, too, of all the works which God hath wrought during certain periods of history, the most glorious in the sight of heaven may have been precisely those which elude his research ; for the domestic virtues, and the affectionate yet humble love of God, which His grace has formed and His blessing matured, are hidden from the public eye.

And if men have lived, who willingly submitted to insult and oppression that they might literally comply with all their Saviour's words, unless they have been religious martyrs whose firmness under the fear or even in the midst of tortures made their courage too manifest to be disputed, it will invariably be found that their character has been mistaken, and if noticed at all, is held up to scorn. He who *having done well, and suffered for it, taketh that patiently*, must have had the Spirit of God poured out abundantly upon him, to make him thus victorious over temptation. But though this be *acceptable with God**, historians in general have felt no admiration for such characters ; and therefore, where they have spoken of them, they have in contempt, or in ignorance of their exalted motives, confounded their conduct with the effects of cowardice, or with the behaviour of the mercenary wretch, who bears the injustice and the contumelies of his superiors in the hope of still making profit out of those who despise him. Details, which, if impartially given, the writer might have rejoiced over, as evidence of the triumphs of steadfast faith, are thus prevented from affording him that encouraging theme.

The reader is reminded of these impediments to an historian's doing full justice to what is excellent, not merely as some apology for what may be defective in the author's work, but that he may not be tempted to form too melancholy a view of the state in which God leaves a people who profess to serve Him. With the same view, let him remember that if two persons arrive at manhood with equal abilities and attainments, and the one follows the glittering prizes of ambition, whilst the other resigns himself to nursing an infirm parent, or training up a household, or a village, in the service of God ; the first, in his efforts to rise in the world will polish and enrich every faculty calculated to dazzle beholders, or may be drawn on to crimes, which fill the page of history ; whilst the second may grow in true wisdom and in grace as he increases in years, but history knows and says nothing of him. Hence, when the reader can discover but one character in the history of an age, on whom his eye may rest with any satisfaction, he may yet not unreasonably hope, that could the extent of God's mercy in saving from sin be laid open before him, as it was to the prophet, he too would know that even then also

* 1 Pet. ii. 20.

God had seven thousand servants who had not bowed the knee to the seducing Baal of their day. This reflection need not mislead any into considering good and bad governors and institutions as on a level. In Ahab's time they who had kept their faith were rare, though not so few as the desponding prophet feared; but in good Josiah's reign it is said, *all present in Israel were made to serve, even to serve the Lord their God**.

But after every allowance for the omissions and misrepresentations in historical documents, with respect to what is truly excellent, the preponderance of guilt in the narrative will remain awfully prominent. It would be somewhat less so, if history was not mainly taken up with describing the conduct of the rich and great. Of them the Lord has told us, *how hardly shall such enter into the kingdom of God †*.

History, from beginning to end, confirms this painful remark. How happy, if it thereby leads its readers to dread riches, rather than seek them; to pity, not to envy the great; to be thankful that the overpowering temptations, which make their being saved so near an impossibility ‡, descend not upon all; instead of being angry and indignant, when they read that the kings, and the mighty of the earth, have given themselves up to work all iniquity with greediness.

But if saddened with the view of human guilt, the reader may find abundant consolation by gaining still more advanced views of God's mercy. For, whilst the world is undoubtedly God's world, when contemplated as such it cannot but be seen to be in a state of almost universal rebellion against Him; and yet He has in every age given repeated proofs that His fatherly love is not quenched.

In no history, except that of His own peculiar people, do the riches of God's mercy appear more conspicuous than in that of England, and they have been peculiarly poured out at periods when it is most evident that national pride can put forward no claim to them as deserved; thus constraining the readers of English history to acknowledge, that they flowed from His free bounty, and that to His unwearied mercy alone is due all the praise.

Our ancestors were lost in gross idolatry; while He cared for them, and sent hither the light of the Gospel. "He saw them worshippers of idols, to whom they paid the service of sinful and bloody sacrifices. He made them the worshippers of Himself and His blessed Son; and made them to be taught to worship Him with an holy worship. But in a little time, their sons forgot Him; and their descendants turned again to abominations, too much resembling those from which they had been delivered. They sunk deep into all the follies, and presumption, and darkness of Popery, and bowed themselves again before graven images. Yet God again remembered them in mercy; and sent amongst them faithful witnesses, by whose preaching He called them once more to the know-

* 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33.

† Mark x. 2, 3.

‡ Ibid. x. 27.

ledge of His holy word ; and made the lot of our inheritance once more the habitation of holiness and truth *.”

And, as if all this were not enough, He has been bountiful in the choicest of temporal gifts. He has made our rulers form for us a Constitution, which is the envy of nations who cannot comprehend the superior value of our spiritual blessings ; and He has exalted the influence and the power of our Island till it extends into every quarter of the world.

God grant that the reader, whilst he learns *how great things the Lord hath done for us*, may also learn to love Him as a Benefactor, who is not, like man, unable to extend his regards at once to great things and small, but looks upon the humblest of his creatures with as unceasing attention as He watcheth over an empire ; and is as ready to save the most despised of those who put their trust in Him, as to *establish kingdoms*, and add unto them *excellent Majesty*.

* Benson's Sermon before the Corporation of Trinity House.

ore

the
m-
pe-
ce
ie

d





